

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XIX.

OCTOBER, 1867.

No 3.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

The Church and the World. First Series; Second Edition.
London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer. 1866.

THE book, whose very significant title we have placed as the heading of this Article, contains eighteen papers, written by about as many Clergymen and Laymen of the Church of England. One is by a woman. The questions discussed are such as pertain to Church work and practice, and the color of the thought is Anglican. This is a remarkable book. It is understood, by many, to be written in the interests of Ritualism. However that may be, no candid mind can fail, in reading it, to be struck by a certain grave dignity and earnestness, in the men who wrote it; and it evidently means more than many Churchmen in this age have as yet discovered. It is a plea, almost a cry to the Church, to become and to remain Herself; and, as a sign of coming events, has a very sober significance to Churchmen. It has behind it the thought of a great multitude, whom no man has yet numbered, and who have, in silence, taken to their heart the vow, God helping them, that Christ's Church shall be made in practice, as She is now in right and theory, Mistress of the World. It signifies more

than it contains, and should be read by every one who cares to study the most resolute and definite thought of our Communion. It will be seen that we regard this book as a very grave affair. The vows, the prayers and the aspirations, that are behind it, make it so. Its present use is, to enable us to discuss the theme which it announces, "THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD," in its relation to the work and duty of the American Church in our day.

By the World, we are to understand all those forces of Humanity, which are either in direct hostility to the will of God, or are as yet unsubdued to the obedience of that Cross of Jesus Christ, which is among men the final and sufficient embodiment of that will. By the Church, we are to understand that divine and authorized Establishment among men, by Which God would absorb and subdue the World to His will. Such is merely the definition of two recognized facts, whose elements are too vast for any exhaustive discussion. Our essay touches only a few things, in regard to the way in which these two facts confront each other. It will be seen, at once, then, that as the Church embodies, and is God's will, put into such shape as best to subdue men to Him,—and the World is that existence or force that is arrayed against Him, these two must be essentially antagonists and enemies. It will be also seen, that, by the very instinct of Her existence, the Church must forever aspire to become, both as Her right, and Her necessity, the Mistress and Ruler of the World. With this aspiration She confronts, in every age, that World which, by an equally organic law, withstands and wounds Her. Her existence then on earth must be a constant struggle after a victory, never uncertain, but long delayed, which God Himself assures. In short, between the Church and the World, there is a warfare XVIII Centuries old, and yet as vigorous to-day as ever; new-fashioned in every age, but bearing in its heart the same old elements of strife, as when the Twelve confronted the Roman Empire, and the Saints conquered the World to the Church, in the mighty passion of life-long sacrifice and martyrdom. It is to the matter of this warfare in our age and land, that the present discussion narrows itself. It is the

American Church and World, that we wish to cause to pass before our most sober and prayerful meditations.

No one, with any pretence to insight, but has discovered that this is a very singular and dangerous age, in respect to the salvation of the human race in the one appointed way of the Church. Modern Civilization, cutting loose, as far as it could, from the antiquity of primitive and Mediæval times, and intensified by the new forces with which it allied itself at the Reformation, in our age has accomplished the most brilliant material successes. It has subdued the forces of Nature, to become the incessant servants of its pride and power; and yet refuses to sanctify them with the thought of their origin *in* God, or consecrate them to the service *of* God. It has penetrated, by its sciences, to the mysteries of all substances, and because, to the eyes of flesh, the doors are shut, it denies that beneath the mysteries is that ever present God, Who conceals Himself behind material forms from the reach of Reason, to disclose Himself, in His glory and His eternity, to the eye of Faith. It has gathered out of the land and sea a wealth, greater than that of any past age, and its riches are deluding it into the atheism which prays to gold as its only and sufficient god. Bereft, by its own irreverent brain, of that humility which learns the profoundest lore at the feet of Prophets and Apostles, and which measures the movements of eternity as they vibrate in the currents of our human life holding the hand of Jesus Christ, it has become its own prophet and apostle, and reveals to its own consciousness a knowledge of the Infinite, by its own finite and human powers. Giving up its adherence to the revealed authority of God as writ in Scripture, and refusing to submit any longer to the Holy Oracles, whether they be from Sinai or from Calvary, it has run mad with an insane lust for individualism of thought and practice, and no longer prays to God, but adores itself. In the delirium of its self-conceit, it would trample under foot the Bible, the Altar, and the Church, that offend its own infallibility, and has no doubt of its ability to subdue God, (if there be One,) should He dare to set Himself against its wonderful progress and acquirements. It demands to be free, and, upon its own motion,

to think, contrive, and compass, whatever may please its own wisdom, regardless of antiquity and of eternity; and yet it is an age that is held, through all its motions, with utter silence, in the iron hand of that God Whom it ignores. It thinks to have destroyed the historic God, as a relic of barbarism, that it may be rid of superstition; and it comes very close to making every man, in the most abject fetichism, a god to himself. It destroys the Divinity, and deifies Humanity. It is, practically, the age of human omnipotence, and it measures its felicity and its progress by its material accomplishments. It has attained to a vast power, and it must be frankly confessed, that this power is, and is becoming, more and more the antagonist of the Church; not in mere morals, which concern human relations,—for, thanks to the Witness of the Church Herself, the heathenism of Christendom professes justice, truth, and charity, as between man and man—but in a certain spirit of insubordination and disregard of the claims or the authority of the only visible Establishment, which ever professed to have a valid claim to men's obedience,—the Christian Church. But above all these details, the great and almost necessary danger of our age is the one of its own position among the ages. The new elements introduced by Modern Civilization have, indeed, brought these things to pass; but they have also made this a transition, an unfixed and changing age. The next age may be worse or better than the present, but the same it can never be. Men are not unchurched and unchristianized in Christendom, because they wish it; but because they have been carried, by the currents of Modern Civilization, to that condition. Men, perhaps, love the truth as honestly in our age as in any other; but so many dream-voices, outcries, are ringing in their ears, that they cannot hear what truth is saying. The age is not debauched in its intent so much as baffled by forces that confuse and blind it. In short, the World in this age confidently confronts the Church, with a claim as master; and it is not uncertain, that the World intends to be obeyed. It is a struggle very old, but in this age, the World has an accumulated energy against the Cross, greater than ever before.

So, on the one side, stands the World. On the other side,

is the Church. They stand opposed to each other, and are already in battle. Which shall be victor? When shall be the end? Above all, by what law, under what conditions, and by what methods must the Church maintain Her cause? In answer, we observe that the Church is old, and Her demand is also old. She is the Church, once and forever, built upon JESUS CHRIST, and nurtured by the Holy Ghost; the Church of the Apostles and martyrs. She is the same Church, then, That once conquered the World to the obedience of the Cross. She has traditions of great victories in Her keeping, and the same gifts of an all powerful God, as when She set the Cross above Cæsar's Crown, and bowed down the wealth and learning of the ancient world at the footstool of Her austere but holy Mysteries. She is the Church of historic conquests. And thus Her attitude is always that of Mistress of the World. She claims, not in any charming inaccuracy of speech, but in the most solemn statement, to own the World; and when She achieves its conquest, in Her old, unselfish fidelity, She gathers up this world, with all its wealth, wit, and strength, and lays it, ransomed and glorified, upon the altar of Her God, as Her Holy and mighty offering unto Him. In the strife for mastery, the Church has always avowed Her supremacy, with an unfaltering tongue. She will not abdicate; She cannot be dethroned. For Her to deny Her claim, would be to peril Her cause. Whether She be forced to hide Herself away in Catacombs from the swords of emperors, or whether all armies and navies wait upon Her bidding, She is neither more nor less than ruler and owner of the world, and Her title-deed thereto is the revealed will of God.

And yet, Hers is a singular rule and ownership. She may leave Law to Parliaments, and yet the laws that live, reach Her Golden Rule through Christendom. The English Statutes are of Edward, or Henry, or Elizabeth, but the cottage of every English peasant throughout the realm derives protection from the sweet charity and philanthropy of his Mother Church towards all the poor and lowly. She enforces nothing with the sword, though She has often suffered by the sword; but Her compelling powers are the forces of Almighty God. Men who

can never understand how Her queenship can be based upon Her humility, and discover Her to be only an unarmed company of men and women offering invisible prayers to an invisible Prince, Who has no visible cohorts to protect His suppliants, affect, as in this age, to despise Her power and to resist Her claim. But the air which gives breath to all cannot be seen, and the force that guides the star is hidden; and when a generation that denies Her majesty, dies into dust and ashes, the Church, immortal, with the majesty of the indwelling Three, asserts Her old claim to mastery before new peoples, who must either obey or perish. In the mere human sense, She may own no gold nor palaces, but it is Hers to command men's wealth to be devoted to the welfare of Humanity, and Her rule is laid upon the inhabitants of palaces. Thus, while to Her is given the world's ownership, She must preserve, in all ages, the poverty of the Carpenter's Son, and the humility of the sackcloth and the travail, in which the Apostles conquered the World to Him, Who, while on earth, had not where to lay His head.

Such, then, is the due, essential attitude of the Church. But the World resists Her. How, then, in this age, shall She subdue the World? In any struggle, every wise combatant will at least study carefully four things. I. His own aim. II. The force and quality of his enemy. III. His own resources. IV. The methods of victory. We have already seen the enemy of the Church to be the World, as also that the aim of the Church is conquest of the World to Jesus Christ. We have now to study those other questions, of the resources of the Church, and Her means of victory.

The resources of the Church, in any age, are in two classes, Divine and human. The powers of the Holy Ghost, flowing in Her life, are out of a Divine and infinite fountain, and as such, can never be subdued. But then, unless the heart of the Church is open to receive this Divine assistance, the assistance is not given, and cannot avail. What the life is to the body, the Holy Ghost is to the Church; and, so far as the Holy Ghost is absent from any member of the Church, so far, not only is that member a dead branch, but the Church Herself is weak against the World. As then, in military affairs, some

soldiers are weak, through disease or dissipation, and others are strong, so that numbers are not an infallible test of military strength, so in the Church, the spiritual growth or decay of Her children, are prime elements in deciding Her power to face and to subdue the World. The true life of the Church is, in any given age, Her strength.

Her victory must be based on Her vitality, as the living and fruitful Body of Jesus Christ. But now, if we estimate the human resources of the Church, in our time and land, it is thousands, against millions,—a steady penury, against an ever augmenting prodigality of money in the service of Her enemy, the World. The Church has numbers, wealth, science, and even fashion, arrayed against Her. The schools of the philosophers, sometimes men from the schools of the prophets, arraign and flout her. Judged by the law of human chances, or weighed in the scale of appearances, the issue seems to have already gone against Her. But, with the World in battle array against Her, the Church remembers Her ancient victories. The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong, as the World's strength is ; but the prize and the battle are to those who wrestle in the armies of the living God. She conquered the Roman world, not by Her numbers, but by Her fidelity and zeal. The fire that consumed heathenism, was the flame of the Holy Ghost, incarnate in the lives of Her great sons and daughters. The Cross was raised in mastery above the Emperor's throne, by the pious hands of faithful and humble Churchmen ; and the World bowed before the Church in a new obedience, as men always bend before that serene and beautiful Bride of Christ, when Church-folk do not obscure Her virtues behind sordid and faithless lives. The conquest of the World by the Church, in our age, demands, then, first of all, a magnificent but holy sacrifice and self-surrender to Her service. No man can weigh the weight of one life, given entirely to any one great calling. In the history of our race, and outside the Church, it has always been a few lives, given to a great cause, which have won the most magnificent victories. In the Church Herself, personal consecration to Her interests have shaped ages by the Cross, and made Her virtues

triumphant. With the zeal of the Apostles, we shall regain the victories of the Apostles. With the self-surrender of the martyrs, and witnessing before this age to Jesus Christ, we build up His kingdom against the World.

The very intensity of our age challenges the Church to action. For men adhere, to-day, with great pertinacity, to their material interests, and spend brain, heart, health, and pains, to win them fortunes of material things. And they logically ask of Church-folk this question. If, as you say, the cause of the Church is the cause of human salvation, how can you expect to convince us, who pursue our aim with such intensity, of your sincerity, by such half-measures and half-devotion as you leisured Churchmen show, in behalf of a cause which, by your claim, is the very chief of causes? Whatever else this age may be, it is intolerant of shams, and for mortal men to assert a cause which concerns the eternity of their fellow-men, in a halting and irresolute fashion, seems, to common sense folk, very like a sham. If Churchmen wrought with the same vigor for Jesus Christ, as business men work for a fortune, a new face would be put upon Church affairs at once.

But, in this age, the World assails the conscience of the Church with spiritual narcotics and sedatives, to hinder Christians from following the austere but holy path of a great devotion to their Lord. It is by a subtle infusion of its own negative spirit in spiritual things into our religious consciousness, that the World keeps us back from achieving victory. We betray our Lord by our leisured idleness, and mock Him with a discipleship that lacks sacrifice. Now, then, it is for every Churchman to know, that no true man lives to be happy, or leisured, or comfortable, but to do Christ's bidding, even when obedience lays a great agony to our heart. The scarlet thread of a sacrifice, even unto death, runs through all the vital ages of the Church. The shadow of the Cross must sadden, while it excites every faithful heart to give itself in travail and weariness to the service of the Church, Who demands of all Her children a self-sacrifice that wounds at the very soul. The Church, built upon the Cross, conquers by the heroic self-surrender of Her children who bear the Cross.

In the struggle which the Church maintains with the World, the discipline of Her own forces is a matter vital to Her success. Submission in any battle half wins it, and the genius of the Church, in sharp distinction from the intense individualism of our age, demands subordination, through all Her ranks, to due authority. But due authority in the Church rests on no man's will or pleasure, but on fixed Canon Law; and to that authority all Orders yield. In the obedience of all, exists the liberty of all. The Church, by Her policy, protects us from the individual, to govern us in a wise, gentle rule, *Herself*. While he stands within that Law, no man can meddle with the Priest. Outside that Law, and no Bishop is, or necessity, to be obeyed. The freedom of our Orders lies in their protection by our Canon Law; for obedience to Law is liberty; obedience to the individual, slavery. The Church recognizes no Popes among Her Hierarchy, and she puts down all insubordination among Her inferior clergy; but whatever is done, is done by due process of Law. She has thus, in Her ranks, that submission which gives steadiness in battle, and yet preserves that personal self-respect, without which soldiers would be merely helots. It follows, then, that it is mere insubordination in a Bishop to judge, authoritatively, where, or as by Canon Law, he has no authority; and, contrariwise, it is very like Ecclesiastical mutiny, for a Priest to judge a matter that belongs to Bishops. The Church wills that every man should keep his own place, in marked contrast to this age, and to Protestantism generally, which puts any man in every place, at his own choice. There is a great cry and judgment among the Priests, occasionally, about some mal-administration in some Priest's Office. Unless we aspire to become an Ecclesiastical mob, like some of our neighbors, it is well to remember, that when we give public judgment (and the act is no less wrong because done anonymously, or through the columns of a newspaper) about what we have no Canonical authority to judge, we sin against Ecclesiastical Order and the common sense of all good Catholics. It is essential to the Discipline of the Church, in Her struggle with the World, that judgment should be left to judges, and the rest of us improve our

silence, to do our work in that station to which it hath pleased God to call us. Church-folk are under Law, and under it, obediently, we must win our battle.

It is a part of the same necessity, that there should be a true Fraternity in the ranks of Churchmen. They who stand within one Church, should feel themselves to constitute one Brotherhood. The very idea of a Catholic Church, carries with it the necessity that Catholics should differ in opinions. For, as God does not destroy personality in a man, by His Grace, so the Church does not seek to destroy, but to regulate individualism in opinion among Her children. Two men can no more think exactly alike, than they can look exactly alike; and to make all men's minds after one pattern, is what the Catholic Church has never wished to do. To torment any man, who stands within Her Creeds and Articles, with new tests and shibboleths of orthodoxy, is a crime against Unity and Charity, and a fountain of endless evils. The Inquisition and the Papacy, our Church threw overboard forever, at the Reformation, and we must keep due guard, that the spirit of the Inquisition be kept out of our Communion. To pass sentence of condemnation upon our brother's Churchmanship, in the Court of our personal opinion, where he is neither bound to plead, and we have no jurisdiction, is purely inquisitorial and the very rags of Rome. It is thus that we protest against all interference, in our Communion, of one man with another, upon his own individual responsibility. The undue assertion of individual opinion vexes, in this age, society and nations into madness. It is a blood-hound in the pay of prejudice, to hunt down opinions of another color from its own. And Catholics, vexed by the incessant clamor of heady or factious men, demand, and will demand, that the voice of the Church alone shall speak praise or blame, and that before She proceeds to judge, with that cautious moderation and charity which are not the least of Her Catholic virtues,—and after,—the individual shall confine himself to silence.

Yet, in affirming this, we condemn much in our current Churchmanship. For, every now and then, our Communion echoes with accusations among men who, by Canon Law and

reason, are brethren. Parties appear to affront the Catholic mind, and to wound Catholic Unity. Now, all clamor and partizanship in the Church affront and weaken Her. It is a bad omen for victory, when soldiers quarrel in the very battle line, and show dissension before the enemy. And, in the American Church, the disease of parties has got to be cured, as cancer is cured, by excoriation.

There may be, besides, two general reasons alleged, why American Churchmen should not be compelled to one general way in administering the Church to the people. In the first place, confronted as we are among Protestants by the most diverse religious tastes and systems, every school of Churchmanship known to us has its own special aptitudes for reaching and subduing to the Cross a certain class of minds. And this is the reason why, often, a style of Churchmanship, which seems to us antagonistic to the general drift of our Communion, is found very serviceable in bringing multitudes within our Fold, who would never follow a more Catholic leading. And as, in our age, he who is not against the Church is for Her, so we, as Churchmen, may well be willing to receive amongst us people who are mere novices in our Ecclesiology, trusting to time and their posterity for the acceptance of a truer Churchmanship. It remains, therefore, for us to allow, within the limit of Canon Law, even a great diversity of theory and practice in Ecclesiastical administration, upon the ground, that in this age more men are reached in this diversity, than by a stricter uniformity. Of course, whatever offends the Canon Law, is contraband, and to be abated ; but what we affirm is this, that all interference with the practices of any school amongst us, whether that school are vulgarly supposed to affect Presbyterianism or Romanism, shall be by due Canonical authority, and that, until that authority moves to trial, every man and school shall be let alone ; both because such a course is seemly, and because the opposite conduct might, for reasons already given, actually peril the doing of good. This statement is made, in the interest of no school whatever, but as a part of that Catholic practice, which the American Church must follow, in Her conquest of America to the Cross.

The second reason which we allege, why Parties should be destroyed by the Grace of God and the pious common sense of Churchmen, is, that Parties in our Church have no logical basis to stand upon, but are the creatures of unreason and mistake. Tendencies in the Church there must be; and these tendencies, put in practice, for reasons already given, may work good in saving men; but Parties imply a more or less serious attack and warfare upon things which they disallow; and it has been found, that it does not satisfy men to follow their own tendency, but they assail its opposite. Now then, every Churchman aspires to assist in the salvation of this world to Jesus Christ; and we all admit that this World is to be saved by the Cross of Jesus Christ. But the Church exists to apply that Cross to the World for its salvation; and our differences are not so much, as to what work we shall do, but how we shall do it. Is it reasonable, then, is it decent, in the eyes of the Catholic world, that honest men, with the same aim, should quarrel about the means? We, who are under one standard, should not, necessarily, be of one opinion in everything; but we should, certainly, be of the same spirit, and that spirit should be charity; and charity will at least strive to do its own work, and not meddle with its neighbors. The American Church, then, in order to conquer the World, which is Her mission here, must be one in spirit, and partake of the true fraternity of Saints!

We have thus aimed at certain conclusions as to the position and resources of the Church. It now remains for us to consider in what fashions the Church must apply Her resources to the conquest of the World. First, then, and in general terms, we say that the Church must apply Herself, as a divinely arranged system, to the heart of the World. Now the very idea of system implies coherency of parts, and those methods of the Church, which form Her system, cohere together, and are as clearly different from any of the Protestant systems as Her origin is. And of that system it may be remarked, how that through it flow that Catholic calmness and patience, which cannot spring into existence in any one age, but are the accumulative fruits of the Holy Ghost, moving the Catholic mind

through all ages. That which is grounded in Eternity, and folded in the arms of Divinity, must always retain, from contact, a certain peace and silence, which are the very tokens of its strength ; and there is nothing which the uncatholic mind oftener mistakes and undervalues, than that silent and patient system, by which the Church goes on to subdue the World. In Protestantism, there is always a feverish unrest and hurry, which make a Religious life spasmodic, and great extremes of heat and cold ; while the Religious consciousness is shocked and stimulated by novel and perishable appliances.

Now, slow growth is sure growth, and nurture and growth in the Church have about them that same patience, with which the coral reefs and deltas of the natural world are built, or the earth leads out the tender blade of spring, through many sunny and cloudy days, to the full corn of harvest. Beginning with the baptismal water, the Church conducts a soul, nurtured and trained in spiritual practices, from the cradle to the grave, in a patient and Catholic education, which may fit it to meet that God Who is beyond the grave ; and Her system, as derived from God, reminds us of that yearly system of the natural world, wherein, in the cycle of every twelve months, harvests are matured in the rain and shine, the frost and heat of ever changing but ever related seasons.

It is not the question, at present, whether our system be right or wrong, but whether, having a system, very different from the Protestant systems around us, we shall follow ours, or theirs. We answer, *ours*, upon penalty of great calamities. We cannot compromise systems, any more than we can dismember bodies and preserve vitality, or make composite and living creatures, by the jointure of the limbs of man and beast ; but the Church system must be followed by Churchmen without compromise, and without alarm. Bad systems, well followed, often conquer, among men, a larger success than good systems, badly followed ; since, in the latter case, the following destroys away from men the fruits of the system ; and the Church must follow, unflinchingly, Her system, in order to achieve Her conquest.

But now the question at once arises, how shall She follow

Her system? Her system must be applied to the heart of the World; and in what ways shall that be done? Here arises one of the most pertinent and profound Church questions of the age. Now, at once, we may observe how, while the system of the Church may not be altered, it may be developed. For "the Church," as has been well observed, "is a living and growing body, not a dumb, inanimate machine, whose movements can be externally controlled and moderated with absolute precision. Her animating principle is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is liberty, and, with perfect unity of purpose, an almost infinite 'diversity of operation.'" For instance, in the system of the Church, the position of a baptized child towards Her, can never be altered; but Her education of that child, in different ages, may be conducted in different fashions, provided those fashions do not compromise the organic relations of the child to its Spiritual Mother. You may baptize a child in only one way, but you may after educate that child, merely by the spoken word, by the represented Sacrifice of Jesus in the Holy Eucharist, or the painted windows, or the Gregorian Chants, or the Church architecture, or by several, or by all of these, according to the child's capacity or opportunity. Indeed, while the things which the Church holds in Her keeping, to apply to the World's heart for its salvation, are immutable, the ways in which She thus applies them are clearly alterable, as Her whole history proves. For, in Her public Service or Liturgy, while She has always held the Holy Eucharist to be the heart of that Service, around which every Liturgy fashions itself, the Liturgy itself may be either more or less, according to the wants or tastes of an age, as determined by Her collected and legal decision. The Use of Sarum, and the Use of St. Gregory, differ in quantity, if not in quality, and the American differs from the Anglican Use in the same respects. For the Church may add or detract Prayers from Her Worship, according to Her sense of what is available, in Her supreme duty of converting the World to God. And this liberty of choice may affect Her Public Worship in two directions; either, upon occasions, to decrease or increase them. For instance, if Morning Prayer be too long for the

patience of a Sioux Indian, She has a clear right to see that it be shorter. Or if, in any Service which brings the Cross to men, more Ritual be serviceable, She may assert the same in practice, provided always it be done by due course of legislation.

It will be seen how, in this connection, the whole question of Ritual offers itself to notice. We all admit that the Church has Forms, and the question of this age is, Shall She have more, or less, or different? To that we answer, that the Church may establish whatsoever Form She pleases, provided it teach, or do not contradict Her dogma, and provided She thinks it to be for the welfare of the souls committed to Her care. But this one rule must direct Her in Ritual; the spirit must create the Form, not the Form the spirit. Without doubt, Forms may aid the spirit, but Liturgy must be developed, as true Liturgy always has been, from the inner spiritual life of the Church. Forms, as expression of the spirit, are valuable; but Forms, instead of spirit, most pernicious. If, by the holding up of the hands at the name of Jesus, the name of Jesus be glorified among the worshippers, then let hands be lifted up. But if, in the lifting up of hands, there be no lifting up of souls, the action, as soulless, degrades the Worship, and no hand should move. By Forms, ancient and historic, the Church stands distinguished from Her neighbors: and Her genius has always led Her to picture forth and body before the eye of the soul, spiritual truths through material forms;—in the white robes of Her Priests, ministering before the altar, bearing upon their shoulders the yoke of the stole, as badge of their subjection to their Lord; in the Crosses that stand above Her Altars; in the windows, brilliant with the images of Saints and Martyrs; in Her Chancels, divided from the people's place; in the cruciform shape of nave and transept; in Her Altars, eastward towards the light; and in a thousand details of color and shape and substance, by which She repeats forth Her everlasting Gospel.

Such, then, being the right and genius of the Church, the question of change in Ritual becomes one of expediency, to be determined by the effect of any change, as assisting Her in

men's salvation. And this we take to be the main question that underlies so-called Ritualism. For, while the Ritualists assume, not to introduce new Rites, but merely to reclaim the old in the interests of the Church, we understand their dogma, viz: that the Church may rightly alter and shape Her Ritual to the new attitude and qualities of men, in this or any age, to be correct. The question, as to what is lawful Ritual, waits on the decision of the Canonical judges of the same, but the question, whether the Church can determine Ritual, cannot be raised. As to the Ritualists, while there undoubtedly are those in the English Church, and our own, who caricature, pervert, and misrepresent true Catholicity, and while the movement, like every other, has both gold and clay in it, this seems clear, that, leaving out of question details, there is a movement begun, which is backed by some of the most earnest and vigorous thought in our Communion. It shows itself in other ways than Ritualism. If these men were merely enthusiasts, over-fond of a certain sort of man-millinery, or very young Deacons, with an acquired hankering after the forbidden fruits of Rome, their movement would have long since perished away into that limbo, where all such human absurdities hide themselves. But whatever impatience, or lack of self-control Ritualism may have already shown, the idea that vitalizes it, and which will maintain it against everything but the suicide of its own possible and illegal excesses, is the idea, warm in the hearts of many unspeaking but resolute Churchmen, that this Church of ours, rich with Her heritage of XVIII Centuries, shall be made free to assume Her due position, as the beautiful Mistress and Ruler of the World, and that whatsoever of beauty, dignity, or Catholicity, have been stripped from Her, shall be restored to Her, until, clad in Her ancient vestments, and employing Her ancient forces, She shall embrace the whole world, to subdue it to the obedience of the Cross of Jesus Christ.

But now Catholics, who desire these things for the Church, are assailed with the charge of Romanizing, as though Rome were that eternal nightmare that should drive honest folk away from the ancient and venerable courts of the House of the

Lord,—the Church. Fidelity to the system and genius of the Church is often followed by a Protestant howl from Sects, whose mission is to bay at Rome, who, however astray she may have gone from Apostolic usage, is still able to outmatch them in her devotion to her own idea, and will last when they have gone to their appointed ashes. By Her history, and by Her dogma, our Church stands over against Rome, as the bulwark of true Catholicism, or, as some folks sadly misname it, Protestantism. Until Rome divests herself of her novel and hurtful errors, that have destroyed Church Unity, both East and West, we shall refuse her Communion, as schismatical and heretical. But it is time that this nonsense about Romanizing, in men whose lives are given to preserve, in the only logical way, the World from Rome, was stopped. Mere Protestantism and Sectarianism are making more perverts to Rome every day, than Catholicism,—a hundred to one. Perversions to the Papacy are generally re-actions from absurd negations to equally absurd assumptions. Papacy is to be conquered by Catholicity, not by Sect; the wrong by the right; not the wrong by the wrong. The dogma of the Holy Trinity is no better and no worse, essentially, because Papists are Trinitarians; and because Papists have their devotions, is no reason why we should not pray. In any case, the question is not what Rome holds, but what the Catholic Church holds; and what the Catholic Church holds, we, as Catholics, must hold; and we must hold it without fear, and against reproach from any quarter. Of course, there is a wide gulf between us and Rome; and if any man pass from us to the other side, he is no longer of us. But this ceaseless accusation of men who stand amongst us, desiring, in their very differences, to be more loyal to the great Mother that bears us all in Her bosom, is, we think, in our humble judgment, scandalous. If many people were as afraid to be false to the Catholic Church, as they are of being implicated with Rome, the Catholic Church would feel a new sense of security, and entertain new hope of an imminent and great success.

In this way we arrive, at last, at the ever impending and present question of actual Church work. That work, multi-

form, perplexing, exhausting, lies at every Priest's door. To lift up and lay this World on the bosom of the Catholic Church, in rest and life, is our task ; and, withal, it is a task that may well sadden the stoutest heart. For, in this age, the World is more and more abstaining from the Church. The wave of the present civilization, especially in its lower currents, is away from the doors of the Fold, and out of reach of the voice of the ordinary shepherds. And this, not so much from wilfulness, but because the men of this age, tormented and blinded by the errors that waited on the Reformation, have lost all sense of anything but the evident deficiencies of Sect. The fatal logic which they follow comes to this, that, as the work and folly of the Sects around them is all they see, there is nothing further in Religion, or in the Church, to be discovered.

The writer of this Article, in years past, came in contact with a large body of men and women, unchurched by the deficiencies and absurdities of Sect. For instance, some have lived through so many Methodist Revivals, untouched, that they have concluded that no Religion can reach their hearts. Others have found in their bald communions so little to bind them to those ways, that they have come to think themselves necessary outcasts from every Ecclesiastical System. Besides, a certain vagueness in Sect administration has deprived men, craving to be guided in definite paths of regular Christian offices, from any actual leadership, and they have strayed out upon the desolate and foggy moors of aimless and endless dreams and speculations. There is a vast congregation of such people, wishing, but not knowing how to be Christians ; who, having abjured the Sects, by a blind but honest instinct for Religion, and not knowing the Catholic Church, which has actually for them all they desire, are fallen away from all pretence of Public Worship. Vast wildernesses of spiritual desolation lie around every meeting-house ; and we think that, had it not been for the Methodists, who carried away from us certain Catholic virtues, in New England country villages without Churches, at the present day, there would exist the profoundest spiritual heathenism in all Christendom. The class we mention, are often persons of more than ordinary sense and thought, with

an instinct for the Church. For we must remember, for our comfort, that while God has made the Church for men, He has also made men for the Church; and we must remark, whether we avail ourselves of the fact or not, how that, in numberless cases, the hearts of men, mysteriously fashioned and moved of God, are crying out for the Catholic Church.

To this point we will only add, that all such phenomena as East Medway, Massachusetts, where, in a Puritan rural community, a Puritan meeting-house has been given up, by Puritan assent, to be consecrated as a Church; where a surpliced Choir celebrate Choral Service, before a congregation of almost unadulterate Puritan blood, to the great refreshment of all concerned,—a phenomenon only intelligible to those who know the vast re-action from Puritan absurdity,—are proofs of the statements we have just made. To this class, who are, in general, moderately educated, and of average wealth, we must also add the rapidly increasing class of the sordidly poor and ignorant. In measure, this class is recruited by immigration, but it is also true, for reasons not here to be discussed, that, while our national civilization is raising the upper classes to still greater fortune, it is bearing down the lower classes with a weight never felt before. The relative position of the mechanic, or the day laborer, has degenerated sadly in the last twenty years, and the Church must confront and anticipate this fact in Her policy. For, as has been well observed by one of the writers in "*The Church and the World*," "The true idea of an effective Church,—that idea which is formulated in the word Catholic,—is, that it should not merely be fully capable of adaptation to the habits of all climates and nations, but that in each nation it should meet the wants of all classes of society, and all types of mind." The Church, then, must aspire to reach all. If the World will not go to the Church, (as it will not and does not,) the Church must go to the World. And She must go to the World *with Her system*, but *by Her children*.

And this raises the question of Orders; in plain speech, of Brotherhoods, and Sisterhoods, as means to attain Church aims. Now, whatever we may judge of Orders like these, this Catholic principle cannot be successfully assailed, viz: that

every child of the Church should be given opportunity to do work for the Church, in the measure of his personal capacity. There is a vast deal of wasted and wasting energy, which, with Her present methods, the Church fails to employ, and which She cannot afford to lose. We do not propose, here, to argue the question at any length ; but, for those who desire practical details, we beg to suggest this very book of "The Church and the World," wherein are both facts and arguments, which we advise all dissentients to answer, before they condemn. But this is clear to every parish Priest, for instance, that in his parish are women,—sometimes several,—who, for various causes, are in that position, that, without infidelity to any human relation, they could give themselves entirely to the service of the Church, and who also desire to do it. In the present state of affairs, the Church gives them no regular and systematic work to do ; which is a loss both to the individual and the Church. For all such willing persons, Sisterhoods, wisely ruled and guided, are a certain and useful refuge.

And what is true of women, is also true of men. There are many men, who, by force of circumstances, have not and will not acquire a liberal culture, and yet are men who understand their own class, and might reach them better than men better educated. We have got to have men to preach Jesus Christ in the highways and byways ; and the highways and byways of the American world are full of men who need preaching, and may be made to listen. In every parish, the Lay element also should be organized into Parish Guilds, or Fraternities, as regularly as any parish organizes under the Civil Law ; and that element, thus organized, should be set to work, and in every parish there is work to do. As to Brotherhoods, such as this book, "The Church and the World," advocates, we have only time to say, that we think the Church demands them, and that their employment is chiefly a question of time. Whoever will faithfully instruct the American Church how to organize them, will deserve thanks. There is plenty for them to do. Besides, these Orders will accomplish not only their special work, but they will be of general service to the Church. The Roman Orders have been, in certain ages, the bulwark of the Papacy,

and the Sisters of Mercy, for instance, have done more for Rome, before the World, than the whole College of Cardinals. Self-sacrifice is full of mastery over the human mind, and the true devotion of men and women to the welfare of Humanity, is a power with which it is very difficult to contend. The Church must outmatch the devotion of this world to temporal things, by Her devotion to spiritual things, and She must fortify Her advice to sacrifice for God, by sacrificing Her wit, wealth, and energies to God, in the service of mankind.

It is true, that there is a fear amongst us, lest the Church would compromise Her dignity, if She should proceed to Her actual duty of reclaiming men to God, in any other way than by Her stately Services, rendered by dignified and very proper Priests, with all the decent surroundings of comely and respectable Parish Churches. But duty carries always with it its own dignity; and the dignity of the Church consists in what She is, and not in what She wears. For instance, we often hear it said, that, if we divide Dioceses, and thereby reduce Episcopal salaries, we degrade and bring to contempt the Episcopate. If the dignity of the Episcopate depends upon its revenues, (as the World holds, and as the Catholic mind never holds,) then the popular sentiment is right. But in one eminent case, at least, this sentiment has been of very fatal influence upon the Church. It was the preëminent station of the Roman Bishop, in temporal things, which assisted him to assert that Supremacy over equals, which has created division East and West in Christendom. St. Paul, when He worked with His own hands in the workshops of Corinth, in a Ministry that has moved the world, was, and is, to the heathen mind, a less magnificent spectacle, than the rich-robed Pontiff, that sacrifices on elaborate altars, and keeps grand state in palaces; but to the Catholic, the magnificence of Bishops proceeds, not so much from the lawn of the Bishop's robes, or the gold and ivory of the Bishop's throne, as from the Bishop's supremacy in sacrifice, by which Bishops should take precedence of other men. In olden times, the Bishop's crosier was a pilgrim's staff, and there is no road so dusty as to degrade that Bishop's dignity, who travels it to lift up, by the road-side, men stripped

and naked from the robbery of sin ; for the way of duty is the *via aurea*, the golden way, before all honest hearts, forever. Duty is always dignified, and sacrifice is always royal. For the Church, the sackcloth of Her humility, Her suffering, and Her sacrifice, is the only purple. In these robes, She once conquered ; in these robes, She must once more conquer the World to God.

Besides, and after all, Her sacrifice is Her one great argument to break down the profane science and learning of this World, that assail Her with denial. The professor's chair may answer Her pulpits, and the Schools of the philosophers have at least a brain to equal the Schools of the prophets. But science cannot answer the Priest, kneeling down to pray by the bed-side of the dying, in some hovel ; nor the missionary, giving up all that cultured men think grateful, to carry the Cross to heathen. There is no Atheism bold enough to revile a martyr, nor able enough to refute self-sacrifice. God rules the World, not more by what He is essentially, than by what He does practically, and so must His Church conquer.

We have thus conducted our argument to its conclusion. We have aspired to present general laws of Church action, rather than details. We have endeavored to state, with moderation, things about which no earnest Churchman can be indifferent. We remarked, in the beginning, that the book whose title heads this Article, was a very grave affair, and that it signified more than it contained. We would not endorse everything in it, but we do say, that it signifies a very solemn movement in the hearts of Churchmen, towards the rescue and enthronement of the Church above the World. It is a movement, wherein, as in all human affairs, that which is the loudest is also shallowest. Of the men engaged in it, many are unknown, and shrink away from notoriety. They have been led to it in diverse paths, but, as they trust, by the Holy Ghost. Some are men who, bereft by God of most of those holy, but human ties, which bind men to earth, cling closer, with their empty hands, unto the Altar, as their only treasure. Others, who, marking the perishableness of all human things, with a thirst for eternity, would lay hold upon the fabric of the Church

as that which alone endures; some, by a perception of how all beauty, and all glory, and all philanthropy, are Hers. They are men, whose aspiration is merely to work for the Church, and die, inspired with the thought, that, over the forgotten graves of faithful Churchmen, the Church will one day be lifted up, in all Her ancient magnificence and sovereignty. They have, with much travail of heart, counted costs, and proceeded to their work. What God may have in store for them, they will endeavor, with humility, to accept; but their hope in the future of the American Catholic Church, no man will wrest away; and they propose to win their way, by simple fidelity to the genius and system of that Church, to Which they have pledged their lives.

It is a movement, if we mistake not, grown slowly, and in measurable silence, to its present position. It will obey the Canon Law, implicitly, and those who, of right, rightly administer it; and it will resist things against Law, both for itself and others. It will set its face against all partizanship, and words that wound any man, of any tendency, who stands within our Communion. It will neither Presbyterianize, nor Romanize, and it will pass, through many words, to the things which belong to Catholicity. Its passion is the Church; because it knows of no Christ, nor Cross, nor sacrifice, except such as the Church contains; and, in all humility, it proceeds to defend and proclaim the Church as Mistress and owner of the World.

ART. II.—SKETCHES OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

II. BISHOPS OF GLOUCESTER.

THE Church of the Benedictine Abbey, at Gloucester, was begun in the time of William the Conqueror ; but, as it was not completed till four centuries after, it had within itself many gradations of architecture. There was the round Arch of the Normans, the obtuse lancet window of two hundred years later, the highly finished Choir, the elaborate Western front ; and the Eastern window was said to be the largest in England. Its tower rose to the height of two hundred and twenty-four feet ; and, stretching to a length of not less than four hundred and twenty feet, the Abbey Church occupied one side of a green, and looked out on an ancient and thriving town, sinking a little towards the North, the South and the Severn ; on the vales of Gloucester and Evesham, the Cotswold Hills and the Forest of Dean.

Here, King Henry VIII. founded one of the new Bishoprics which he had intended ; and most of the County of Gloucester was within the Diocese, of which the Benedictine Church formed the Cathedral. He placed over it Robert Wakeman, the Abbot of the neighboring Monastery of Tewksbury, a native of the neighboring shire of Worcester, and a pupil of Gloucester College. After the dissolution of the Monasteries, he had been made a Chaplain of the King ; and he now presided at Gloucester, from 1541 to 1549, conforming passively, it would seem, in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. An aged Abbot, placed in the Episcopate because he was an aged Abbot, could be expected to do little more.

The second Bishop was John Hooper ; who, four years before his elevation, had returned from exile, at the age of fifty-two, and who, in the course of his career, had been ripening for a most illustrious crown, through every variety of trial. Originally of Somersetshire, he had his education at Merton College, and afterwards joined the Cistercian or White Monks ;

but, becoming weary of their Order, returned to Oxford. A spark from the writings of Zwingli and Bullinger, kindled a flame in his bosom. We hear of him as disputing with Bernard Gilpin, who had not then embraced the reformed doctrine; and, when the bloody Act of the Six Articles was passed, he retired, and entered into the service of Sir Thomas Arundel, as his steward. There he was scarcely safe; for, at one time, he was sent to Bishop Gardiner, who detained him five or six days; and he soon thought it prudent to withdraw to France. A friend, whose life he had once saved, lent him a horse; he reached the seaside, and crossed in safety.

But his abode in France was disagreeable; he returned, was sought, and in the disguise of a master mariner, made his escape to Ireland, and from Ireland to Zurich. Abroad, he applied himself to the study of Hebrew; married a German lady; and published a Declaration of Christ and His Office, and an Answer to Gardiner. When tidings of the death of King Henry reached him at Zurich, and he was about to take leave of Bullinger, he said, prophetically, that the last news of him which should ever come to his hospitable friends in that city, would be, that his body had been consumed to ashes.

Arrived in England, he preached daily, and often thrice a day, with fervid eloquence, and published, in rapid succession, a Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ, a Declaration of the Ten Commandments, a translation from Tertullian, and a course of Sermons on Jonah. He informed against Bonner; and, being made a Chaplain of the Protector, Somerset, he urged on the Court the substitution of Tables for Altars. His own example was rigid, and although, on better acquaintance, he had much sweetness, yet so austere was his manner, that a sinner who had come to open to him his grief, was known to have gone away in silence. He is described as tall in stature, of strong body, sound health, pregnant wit and invincible patience, spare of diet, sparer of words, and sparest of time.

Whatever was noble, and whatever was extreme, in the Puritan scholars and divines of the next generation, had its germ in such a character; and thus it could not but happen, that when, after the decline of Somerset, the aspiring War-

wick, who saw in Hooper one of the most conspicuous preachers of the time, furthered his elevation to the See of Gloucester, the Episcopal vestments, which then included the square cap and the scarlet chimere, would offend his choice and conscience. The elder prelates feared the result of excusing him from wearing them, even on the intercession of Warwick and the King; and, in accordance with the method of the times, he was confined to his house, and, when he ventured to publish a Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith, was thrown into prison. There, he gravely questioned himself, whether, for such a cause, he would be justified in relinquishing his Ministry, and at length consented to wear the vestments in his Cathedral, and on occasions of great solemnity. His Episcopal arms were, a lamb in a fiery bush, beneath sunbeams.

At Gloucester and at Worcester, when, on the deprivation of Heath, that See was added to his charge, Hooper presided with large hospitality and diligent watchfulness. A number of poor people were always entertained at his table, and, after being examined in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, were served before other guests. On some occasions, he preached even four times a day: his life was eminently holy; and he was blamed only for the strictness of his discipline. Sir Anthony Kingston was cited into his Court for adultery; and, in a moment of anger, struck the Bishop. He was fined five hundred pounds; and he lived to thank him, even while he was on guard over him at the stake. When Mary came to the throne, the robust integrity of the piety of Hooper appeared complete, beyond even that of his fellow-martyrs. Not for a moment did he swerve from his allegiance to the lawful inheritor of the throne, while he yet refused to flee, saying, that the shepherd should die with the flock.

He was sent at once to the Fleet Prison, and speedily deprived. Of all the sufferers, he perhaps was most prompt and decided in his answers, as if he had but to finish his work, and be gone. In January, 1555, it was decided that he should be sent down to Gloucester, to die where he had strewed the seed of his doctrine. His wife, and Daniel and Rachel, his children, were safe in Germany; and with them, his Treatise on False

Religion, and his "Hyperapismus." With an unwonted cheerfulness, he mounted his horse, and pursued the journey of several days, homeward. Seven thousand persons assembled to see him die; and it was observed, that his countenance had never seemed so joyful. Standing upon a stool, and chained to the stake, he asked for a quick fire; but the wood was green, the wind blew the flame away, the gun-powder exploded without effect; and for three-quarters of an hour he endured the mortal agony. Continually he smote upon his breast, at first with both hands, and when one was consumed, with that which remained, till it clave to the hot iron of his chain, and cried aloud, "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me, and receive my soul." At last, he bowed himself forward, and yielded up his spirit as quietly as a child sinks to sleep in his bed. That day was never forgotten at Gloucester.

In the mean time, James Brookes, a bold, violent, and unshrinking man, sat down in the vacant seat. He was forty-two years old, a native of Hampshire, and had been Chaplain, or Almoner, to Bishop Gardiner, and Master of Baliol College. When Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer, were condemned, he was a willing judge; and, whatever allowance may be made for the vehement language of the age, and the strong indignation of persecuted men, it is not credible, that one whom Jewel could call "an impure beast," and of whom he could report to a correspondent, that, before he died, he exclaimed, that he was justly damned, could have been worthy of that respectful remembrance, in which even the Reformers, after all their sufferings, could hold some of his brethren. He died in the February after the death of Queen Mary.

In the Convocation of 1553, after it had become certain that Popery was to be reëstablished, six members ventured to offer a perilous resistance, by argument. One of these courageous Clergymen was Richard Cheyney, Archdeacon of Hereford; and it is possible that his danger may have been somewhat the less, because his avowed belief on the Sacramental question was, essentially, that of Luther, and of course less decisively contrary to the Papal doctrine of Transubstantiation than that of most of the English confessors. He was born in London,

and educated at Pembroke Hall, the College of Ridley and Grindal; was a good Greek scholar, favoring the new pronunciation, just introduced; and, in the time of King Edward, had been much at the Court. Notwithstanding his stand in the Convocation, he was permitted to live in privacy, till the accession of Elizabeth, when he obtained the small benefice of Halford, in Warwickshire. He preached much in the surrounding country, and, at first, refused the offers of his friends to obtain for him higher preferment; but, being called to officiate at Court, was tempted, by a kind salutation from Cecil, to write a playful letter, lamenting his narrow income. Cecil requested Archbishop Parker to name him for some fit place, and Parker suggested the Provostship of Eton; but he received in its stead the See of Gloucester, after it had been suffered, as one of the new Bishoprics, to lie for three years unsupplied. He had also, for a time, the charge, and it would seem, for a longer time, the revenues, of the Diocese of Bristol. The Commission was withdrawn by the Archbishop; and Cheyney, who, though a learned and resolute man, was eccentric and querulous, had made his petition, that he might resign his own See, complaining of rash and ignorant preachers, and, after his contest at Bristol, which has been mentioned in the account of that Bishopric, renewed his request; but it was never granted. He seems, however, to have been viewed with distrust, both from his Lutheran judgment and his personal peculiarities; and Campian, the Jesuit, wrote to him as if his attitude were antagonistic to the Reformation, calling him "the hate of heretics and the shame of Catholics." During the session of the Convocation of 1571, he left London, without leave from the Primate, and without appointing a proxy; so that he was the only Prelate who did not sign the Canons; and it is a part of the records of that Convocation, that, for this contumacy, he was unanimously excommunicated, but afterwards absolved, when his Chaplain had appeared with his authority, and pleaded his illness. By a too expensive state, too, he exceeded his resources; and, in 1576, his lands and goods were seized for a debt to the Queen. Long after his decease, which occurred in 1578, the Papists spread a rumor, that he had died in their

communion. This story, so often renewed where the ground for suspicion has been even less, was repelled by evidence; and the faults which mark the Episcopate of Cheyney, appear but as those of eccentricity and weakness. He was buried in the Cathedral.

Another vacancy of three years followed, before John Bullingham, a Prebendary of Worcester, received his consecration. In his youth, at Magdalen College, Oxford, Julius Palmer was his friend; and both were devoted to the cause of the unreformed Religion. When the Reformation was settled, under King Edward, Bullingham went abroad, and lived in Normandy, till the change at the death of the young sovereign. Returning then, he met Palmer one day in St. Paul's, and heard from his own lips, that, impressed by the sight of the suffering martyrs, he had embraced their doctrine; and he renounced his intimacy, and soon heard also the tidings of his noble martyrdom. At the accession of Elizabeth, Bullingham was deprived of all his preferments; and when, afterwards, he became an earnest professor and teacher of the truth for which his friend had died, it must have been with a painful remembrance of their parting. His sincerity in error, however, had once been proved by his willing exile; and his zeal for the truth was now such, as no earthly interest could well dissemble. He remained at Gloucester till his death.

On the twelfth of November, 1598, along with three other Prelates, Godfrey Goldsborough was consecrated; who, like his predecessor, was taken from the adjoining Diocese of Worcester, where he had held the Archdeaconry of the Episcopal city. At Trinity College, Cambridge, he had been a pupil of Whitgift, who, after his own elevation, enrolled him, with several others of the worthiest and most learned of his College associates, amongst his Chaplains; and he had also a Prebend in St. Paul's. He was laid, in 1604, in his own Cathedral; and his wife, "a godly matron," survived amongst her children, and was able, by her personal testimony, to vindicate the memory of Bishop Cheyney against the reports of the Popish emissaries.

Not very willingly, a wise and good divine, Thomas Ravis,

Dean of Christ Church, next accepted the Bishopric. He also was a Chaplain of Whitgift. His birth was at Malden; his parentage worthy; his early education at Westminster School, which he afterwards encouraged, with its scholars; and he had been Vice-Chancellor at Oxford, and was one of the translators of the Bible. There were those at Gloucester, who now disliked the name of Prelacy; but when, after two years, he was called up, still with reluctance, to the See of London, his goodly form was missed by all from their Cathedral, and he left behind him no sentiment but respectful affection.

Still another Chaplain of Whitgift, Henry Parry, succeeded; a native of Wiltshire, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; now at the age of forty-six, and Dean of Chester. In 1591, he had published "*The Sum of Christian Religion*," translated from Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism. He is described as an able theologian, read in the Fathers, a thorough disciplinarian, and one of the favorite preachers of King James, whose brother-in-law, the King of Denmark, on a late visit to England, had given him a rich ring, after hearing one of his sermons. In 1610, he succeeded his friend and neighbor, Bishop Babington, at Worcester.

A single year comprised the entire Episcopate of Giles Thompson. He had been a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, a Canon of Hereford, Dean of Windsor, one of the translators of the Bible, and a preacher of much eminence.

On his death, Miles Smith, one of the most learned men of a learned age, especially in the oriental tongues, was consecrated, at the age of sixty-three. The son of a fletcher at Hereford, who was "a man of no mean estate," he belonged, successively, to Brasen-nose College, Christ Church, and New College; and then sat down to his books, as Canon Residentiary of the Cathedral of his native city. Quiet and laborious, he prepared himself, by many years of study, for such a call as found him, when the new version of the Scriptures was to be undertaken; and he it was, who was employed to revise it before publication, and to write the Preface. He had never sought preferment, and all his covetousness was for a library; but preferment followed these labors. As a Bishop, he, like

most of his brethren, favored the Calvinists ; and he leaned always, in matters of Discipline, to the gentler side. When, in 1616, Laud was made Dean of Gloucester, and, even then intent on his design of Ritual reformation, resolved to remove the Communion-table to the eastern end of the Choir, he was met by the firm resistance of the Bishop, who protested, that, if the intended innovation were introduced, he would never come within the walls as long as he lived. It is related that he kept this hasty and unworthy resolve, and worshipped elsewhere, till at his death, in 1624, he was brought in for burial. He had been more than once married, and by his first wife, Mary Hawkins, of Cardiff, had two sons, who took their names from himself and from his brother, Prebendary at Hereford, Bishop Babington, to whom he had given some assistance in his *Notes on Genesis*.

A week before the death of King James the First, Godfrey Goodman was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester ; and he lived in this See to witness the overthrow of royalty itself. He afterwards said that the See had been forced upon him by that sovereign, on condition that he should soon be removed to a wealthier ; and if it were so, the end of his Episcopate too well corresponded with its abject beginning. Born at Ruthyn, he was bred at Westminster School, under the eye of his uncle, Gabriel Goodman, the distinguished Dean, and afterwards was of Trinity College, Cambridge. His parentage was honorable ; and, though a younger son of a younger brother, he had a good estate, and was the less excusable in his ambition. Till thirty-seven, he was Rector of Stapleford Abbots, in Essex, and a Canon of Windsor ; then he became Dean of Rochester ; and at forty-two Bishop of Gloucester, still holding his Canonry and a living in Berkshire. He was charitable to the poor, and though obstinate, inoffensive ; indisposed to severity, but restless, complaining and undignified ; and, altogether, the selection was unfortunate. Besides, he was ill at ease in his place and in his conscience. Within a year after his consecration, he was reproached for uttering at Court, in a sermon, language that favored the Romish doctrines. In the next year, the House of Commons named him as suspected.

The agent of the Roman Court, whose communications have since seen the light, relied upon him.

After he had been disappointed in his hope of translation in 1636 to Hereford, and, for some cause, had been fined three hundred pounds by the High Commission Court, he desired leave to go abroad. Among other reasons, he alleged that he was not highly esteemed in his Diocese; and that he would gladly see the practice of the Church of Rome, of which he owned that he had never an ill opinion. His request was refused by the officers of State, and not without contempt; for, neither his manners nor his temper could inspire reverence. He prosecuted a clergyman for speaking lightly of the Blessed Virgin; and he was often complaining of the Reformers, calling Bishop Ridley, for example, "a very odd man," to which some one replied, that "he was indeed a very odd man, for all the Popish party in England could not match him with an equal in learning and religion." There were those at Gloucester, whose parents had witnessed and described the scene when their second Bishop was offered up; and they might well hold in low esteem the weak man, who now sat in the seat of Hooper. At length, the Canons of 1640 tested his conscience; and, in the Convocation, he declined subscribing with the other Bishops of the Province of Canterbury. He was thrice admonished by the Primate, who then pronounced that he ought to be deprived, asked the opinion of the Prelates, and directed the sentence to be prepared. In the mean time, Bishop Goodman subscribed; but, being asked if he acted voluntarily and without equivocation, evasion or reservation, answered only that he subscribed. The Lower House requested that the inquiry might be urged; and, before they parted, Goodman was suspended from his Office and Episcopate. Some months after, he made his submission and was absolved; but he had first been in custody, and, singularly enough, the extreme unpopularity of Laud and the Canons gave him a temporary favor with the most bitter haters of Popery. He went to the Tower in 1641, with the other Bishops who had signed the protest against Parliamentary proceedings in their absence. After the dissolution of the national system, he lived in private at West-

minster, known as a Papist, and entertaining himself with projects and novelties. He had a design for restoring the impropriations to the Church ; he was concerned in bringing the water of the New River to London ; he went to Cromwell with a pedigree, which was to demonstrate the relationship between the Protector and the Vicar General of Henry VIII. ; and he wrote an account of the Court of James I., which was not printed till two centuries after. He died in 1655, avowing in his last will the belief that in no other Church is salvation, except so far as it concurs with the Church of Rome. He left a legacy to his birthplace, for the benefit of young men who were to go abroad ; some books to Trinity College, Cambridge, and some wood for the repairs of Churches ; and he had given, in 1638, an advowson to the Corporation of Gloucester, with the condition that the benefice should be held by any descendant of his family who should apply for it, if duly qualified ; and it has thus been held, within the present century, by the Rev. Godfrey Goodman. One of the weakest, but not one of the worst of English Ecclesiastics, was that Bishop, who alone, from amongst all the Prelates of his country, since the settlement of the Reformation under Elizabeth, has been tempted back to the yoke of bondage.

Was it wonderful that the city of Gloucester sided zealously with the Parliament, and enclosed itself within its fortifications, and held the banks of the Severn against a cause which it could hardly fail to view with strong aversion ; since Laud, and those who shared his authority, had so disturbed the old age of one of its best Bishops, had dishonored the memory of another by forbidding the Book of Martyrs, and had placed in their stead a Romanist, long undecided, but abundantly decided at last ?

At the Restoration, the fortifications of Gloucester were levelled. The judgment and friendship of the great Lord Clarendon obtained its Episcopate for William Nicholson. The son of a rich clothier in Suffolk, Nicholson was a Chorister at Magdalen College, Oxford, Master of Croydon Free School, Chaplain to the Earl of Northumberland, Rector of Llandilo Vawr in Carmarthenshire, Vicar of Carmarthen, Canon Resi-

dentiary of St. David's, and Archdeacon of Breckneck. Perhaps the interest of the House of Northumberland, which took the popular side, may have been the cause of his appointment to the Westminster Assembly ; but he never attended its sessions. In his retirement in Wales, during the depression of the royal cause, he undertook a school, along with Jeremy Taylor and another ; and honestly and honorably sustained himself, having the reputation of a matchless grammarian. In 1657, he ventured an "Apology for the Discipline of the Ancient Church of England." After his elevation, he wrote on the Creed and Catechism, and published, also, an excellent and pious analysis of the Psalms, under the title of "David's Harp Strung and Tuned ;" works which are not yet forgotten. He was sixty-two years old at his consecration, and presided eleven years, during nine of which he was a widower. Bishop Bull wrote his epitaph, characterizing him as a frequent preacher, a nervous writer, one on whose brow shone Episcopal gravity, and whose daily charity was felt by the poor.

John Pritchard was born in London, or its neighborhood, was of Queen's College and St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford ; and, both before the commencement and after the close of the troubles, was Rector of St. Andrew Undershaft, in the Metropolis. He was, subsequently, a Prebendary of St. Paul's, Rector of Harlington, and Vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate ; and was permitted to hold these three preferments after his promotion to the See of Gloucester. Evelyn heard him preach, "very allegorically, according to his manner, yet very gravely and wittily, in a manner very like Bishop Andrews, full of divisions, and scholastical, and that with much quickness." Of that class of preachers, he must have been almost the latest. Like his predecessor, he was indulgent towards a non-conformist pastor ; "for, they had known adversity." On the first day of the year, 1681, he died, at Harefield, in Middlesex.

The Dean of Gloucester, Robert Frampton, was raised to the chair of the Bishop. His was a meek and quiet spirit, choosing rather the walks of practical piety, than those of even needful controversy. "I would rather," he wrote to the pious Kettlewell, "speak five words to make my perusers better,

than ten thousand words to make them more learned." Yet he could give, also, some unusual instruction ; for, at one period of his life, he had resided at Constantinople, and had been twice at Jerusalem. He was a very moving preacher ; and, revered as he was for his holiness of life, it is not strange, that a man of the spirit of Evelyn should recommend him to the patron of his own parish, on a vacancy. Raised, now, from a Prebend of Salisbury to the Deanery, and then to the Episcopate of Gloucester, he strove only to maintain a good conscience at every cost. He incurred the displeasure of James II., by preaching against Popery ; he signed the petition against the royal Declaration ; and was one of the seven Prelates who were tried and acquitted, in the crisis of that great struggle. In his Diocese, he gave it under his hand to one who objected to the surplice, that it was not to be worn for any supposed holiness in the garment, but only for decency and comeliness. But his patient and conscientious mind leaned to the side of personal sacrifice, and shunned the responsibility of a great public decision, when the Revolution had dethroned his misguided sovereign. He voted for a regency ; and he declined taking the oaths to William and Mary. A kind offer of maintenance, with a tutorship, awaited him ; and he lived eighteen years in deep retirement. There, the venerable old man, unlike most of his non-juring brethren, was seen at the parish Church, and often catechized in the afternoon, and expounded the Sermon ; a beautiful spectacle of Christian lowliness and fidelity. Dying at the great age of eighty-six, he was privately buried, at Standish, within his former jurisdiction. A legacy of a hundred pounds, to be appropriated for the propagation of the Church in America, at the direction of Bishop Compton, made him a benefactor of the parish of Burlington, in New Jersey.

Amongst the Prebendaries, at the time of the Revolution, was one who had been born in the Diocese, had been long an active Clergyman in London, and, just in the manner in which Bishop Frampton was not distinguished, had obtained a stormy eminence. This was Edward Fowler, to whom the new government gave the vacant Episcopate. His father, and two of

his brothers, had been ejected at the Restoration. The future Prelate himself, who had been regarded, at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, as a gifted young man in extemporaneous prayer, had been one of the College Chaplains, and, becoming Chaplain to the Countess of Kent, had been presented by her to the Rectorship of Northill, in Bedfordshire, was at first dissatisfied with the Act of Uniformity, but afterwards conformed, and received Episcopal ordination. He was of the same class of divines with Tillotson, Henry More, Cudworth, Worthington, and Whichcot. Weary of the contests of the preceding generation, they fixed their eyes on the internal fruits of the Gospel, and gave themselves and their writings to the work of promoting these; and some of them were led to attribute an undue value to the principles of Natural Religion. Fowler stood forth as their voluntary champion, and published, in 1670, "the Principles and Practices of certain Moderate Divines of the Church of England, (greatly misunderstood,) truly represented and defended." In the following year, appeared his "Design of Christianity," which was attacked by no less a person than Bunyan, in his prison, as endangering the doctrine of Justification. The reply of Fowler was severe, and he chose to name it, "Dirt Wiped Out." Archbishop Sheldon collated him, in 1673, to the Rectorship of Allhallows, Bread Street; and in 1681, he succeeded Bishop Pritchard, at St. Giles, Cripplegate. His Prebend at Gloucester had been given him, at the resignation, and on the solicitation of Henry More. No elegance adorned his pen; but his reasoning was strong, and, during the Romish controversy, his pamphlets and sermons were, again and again, before the public. His name was the second on the list of London Clergymen, who refused to read the Declaration. He could not hesitate to accept the place of Frampton; nor could he be charged, in this, with the slightest inconsistency, as he had never upheld the system of passive obedience. No other Bishop of Gloucester has presided so long, for he lived to be eighty-two, and died only about the time of the accession of the house of Brunswick. It was not strange, that one, who was daring enough to place himself in the front of what was called the Latitudinarian cause, should

give or take offence, amidst the Ecclesiastical discussions of the times. "Certain propositions," by which he apprehended that Natural Reason and the Doctrine of the Trinity were best reconciled, sustained such assaults, that he was compelled to write three several defences. He attended the Socinian writer, Firmin, as his intimate friend, in his last illness. In 1706, he published "a Discourse on the Descent of the Man, Christ Jesus, from Heaven," which involved him in another controversy. From Bunyan to Hickes, and from the Quakers to the Romanists, he had been in conflict with every class of adversaries. He died in 1714, at Chelsea, and, having been twice married, left several children; of whom one, a Linen-draper in London, married the grand-daughter of Tillotson.

Of the same political principles was Richard Willis, the first Prelate appointed after the accession of the Hanoverian family. It was he who, while Dean of Lincoln, preached, in 1704, the first Annual Sermon before the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. When Smalridge was displaced, he succeeded to the Office of Lord Almoner. He debated with ability, and, in 1718, spoke in favor of the repeal of the acts against Occasional Conformity and Schism, endeavoring to remove from the Dissenters the imputation of hypocrisy; and was also heard in favor of a bill for limiting the Peerage. After six years, he was removed from Gloucester to Salisbury.

At the age of forty-eight, Joseph Wilcocks, a Prebendary and afterwards Dean of Westminster, author of "Advice to Protestants residing in Foreign Parts," received the See of Gloucester. At fifty-eight, he exchanged it for that of Rochester, which, for the greater part of the century, was linked to the Deanery of Westminster.

For the first time, a Prelate was translated to Gloucester from another Diocese. This was Elyas Sydal, Bishop of St. Davids. He died, after three years, without leaving any distinct remembrance.

The Earl of Huntingdon, the husband of the celebrated Methodist Countess, obtained, next, the elevation of Martin Benson, Archdeacon of Berkshire, who had been his Tutor, and had travelled also with the Earl of Pomfret. He was

Rector of Bletchley, and a Prebendary of Hereford, Salisbury, and Durham. At Tewksbury, he had been a beloved schoolmate of Secker and Butler ; and though, going to Westminster School and Christ Church, he was separated from them for a time, the friendship was subsequently perpetuated in the highest places of the Church, and went with them all to the grave. Patronage was not misbestowed, when he was raised to the bench ; for they who knew him best, saw in him not only a pleasing deportment, but considerable abilities, and unaffected earnestness. The line of Pope is well known :—

“Manners with candor were to Benson given.”

Soon after he came to Gloucester, he heard of George Whitefield, a young servitor at Pembroke College, who, coming home for his health to his brother the innkeeper, employed himself in visiting the poor and the prisoners. Observing, too, his demeanor at Church, he sent for him, one evening, after the Service ; inquired his age, which was twenty-one ; and told him, that, although he had resolved to ordain none under twenty-three, yet he should think it right to admit him, whenever he should apply for Orders. He accordingly ordained the youth, and gave him five guineas ; and when he was told that his first sermon, at St. Mary-le-Crypt, had driven fifteen people mad, he wished that their madness might not be forgotten before the next Sunday. Whitefield went out to Georgia with his approbation and blessing ; but he lived to regret his ordination, when he saw the irregularity and other faults of a career in many respects so pure ; and in 1739 he wrote to him letters of serious admonition. Bishop Benson, like his friend Butler, was subject to a depression of spirits ; but he habitually preserved his cheerful aspect. Towards the end of his life, a contest between two of the Canons and the Dean, caused him distress. Attempting, in the opinion of Warburton, to unite “manners with candor,” he carried his decision in favor of the Canons, in person, to the Dean, who took advantage of the informality. The life of Benson was shortened by his assiduous attendance on Bishop Butler, when he came to Bristol to die. He survived him but eleven weeks ; and, after suffering much

pain, expired with a calm trust in his Redeemer ; and, by his own direction, was buried, without pomp, in the Cathedral.

The next Bishop, James Johnson, was of Oxford, and having been second Master of Westminster School, had been selected to be Preceptor to the heir of the throne. Having attended George II. when he was abroad, he was made Residentiary of St. Paul's, in 1748, and in 1752 received this Bishopric. But an embarrassing rumor met him at the threshold. A story, originating with that idle maker of scandal, Horace Walpole, was cited in the House of Lords, to the effect that, along with Lord Mansfield and Lord Dunbar, Bishop Johnson had been accustomed, twenty years before, to drink the health of the Pretender. The charge was withdrawn, and the Lords pronounced that his character ought not to be affected. Lord Mansfield, it is said, dictated for him a sermon, to be preached in 1759, on the anniversary of the martyrdom of King Charles I. ; and in that year he was transferred to the neighboring, but more conspicuous, See of Worcester.

The name of the most extraordinary amongst all the Ecclesiastical dignitaries of England, is next in the catalogue. The father of William Warburton was the Town-Clerk of Newark ; and the son became clerk to an attorney, and was admitted to practice ; being, it is believed, the only instance, since the Reformation, of a Bishop in England, who had been trained at no University. Soon abandoning the Law however, he obtained Orders at the age of twenty-four. Some miscellaneous translations introduced him to the public, and were dedicated to Sir Robert Sutton, who presented him to the livings of Gresley, and Brant Broughton. In the mean time, he had been in London, and had formed literary connections with some of the writers of the metropolis. An Inquiry into the "Causes of Prodiges and Miracles," gave him some reputation ; which was soon and wonderfully enhanced by his "Alliance of Church and State," and the first volume of his "Divine Legation of Moses." These appeared in rapid succession, but were the fruit of long preparation of mind ; and Warburton, still but a country Clergyman, at the age of forty, athletic, and rather awkward and absent, was known as an intense student by those

who knew him at all, and as a voluble and eloquent talker. As he grew in fame, his bold and impetuous pen was alike ready to exercise itself on an edition of Shakspeare, on principles of fundamental Law, on National Policy, or on the mightiest themes of Religion. His *Vindication of the "Essay on Man,"* introduced him to Pope, who became his close friend and brought him into the acquaintance of his own friend Allen, of Bath, whose niece, Gertrude Tucker, Warburton married, when he was forty-seven. The benchers of Lincoln's Inn made him their preacher, and Archbishop Herring exercised his metropolitan power of giving him a Doctorate.

His writings, by their dogmatism, their paradoxes, and their audacity, aroused a host of combatants ; and he was ever armed, to cast himself into the literary quarrel of friend or antagonist. Stebbing, and Sykes, and William Law, replied to him ; while he edited Pope, sustained Middleton, examined Bolingbroke, remarked on Hume, and at length engaged in a severe and not unequal contest with the learned and elegant Lowth. Unmeasured in his invective, often coarse in his vehemence, he yet wrote with immense copiousness, facility, invention and force ; and the finest minds of his age had pleasure in the beams of this comet in the heaven of English Theology. Bishop Hare was his patron ; Lord Mansfield obtained for him a valuable Prebend of Durham ; Lork Hardwicke, a Prebend of Gloucester ; Hurd attached himself to him with a cordiality astonishing in one so cold, and a submission not less surprising in one so able ; Doddridge was his correspondent till his death, and just before, received from him a very affecting letter ; Lord Chesterfield offered to take him, as his Chaplain, to Ireland, in the way to high promotion ; Mason received his advice, and Sterne, his judicious reproof ; and Bishop Newton submitted to him, before publication, his *Dissertations on the Prophecies*.

As a Chaplain of the King, he by no means suppressed, at the Court, his natural freedom of remark ; and, in the Cathedral of Durham, he laid aside the rich and inconvenient attire, which, till then, had been retained by the Prebendaries. In 1757, he became Dean of Bristol. His "*Julian*" was now

published, and afterwards, his "Lincoln's Inn Sermons;" while he sat in Bedford Row, reading, with even more than the intellectual voracity of Johnson, and turning from his graver studies, at times, to whole baskets of Romances and Tales of Chivalry. Haughty in controversy, yet kind amongst his friends; affectionately cherishing his aged mother, and loving to remember his youthful studies at Grantham, and his rambles, book in hand, in the lanes about Newark; the greatest theological writer, if not the greatest theologian, of his age, yet satirically placed, by Voltaire, amongst the assailants of Christianity; such was he, who, at the age of sixty-one, entered the Cathedral of Gloucester; a man tall, now majestic, and afterwards venerable, with a brilliant, searching eye, and a very expressive countenance.

He resided much in the neighborhood, at Prior Park, near Bristol, a seat inherited by his lady from her uncle; but found little to employ his peculiar powers, or to attract his by no means pastoral tastes, in the administration of his Diocese. Of the two neighboring Deans, Tucker, of Gloucester, the able writer on the Principles of Commerce, and Squire, of Bristol, afterwards Bishop of St. David's, he said, in his strong way, that the "one made trade his religion, and the other, religion his trade." He determined to require, that Candidates for Confirmation should have reached, if boys, the age of sixteen, if girls, that of fourteen; but for Ordination, he had very few candidates. Soon after his elevation, he published his "Doctrine of Grace," against the Methodists, which Wesley, who feared no man, was not at all afraid to answer. About the same time appeared his work on the Lord's Supper. He attacked Wilkes, in Parliament, for his immoral writings, and drew upon himself much illiberal abuse. In his unhappy controversy with Bishop Lowth, complaint became very personal, and reconciliation was made slow and difficult. His sayings were often crushing. At a meeting of the Bishops at the Palace of the Primate, when it was stated that Doctor Ridley was to answer the Life of Cardinal Pole, by Phillips, the spirit of the veteran controversialist was aroused, and he told his brethren that, in former times, the Bishops themselves wrote in

defence of the Church and the truth. On one of the few occasions on which he went to Court, he heard a Lord in waiting say, "move forward ; you clog up the doorway." "Did nobody clog up the king's doorway more than I," was the reply, "there would be room for all honest men." A musical Festival, at Gloucester, drew his contempt ; and he said, that they had offered to God the price of two harlots.

But age, with its infirmities, stole on : a broken arm, attacks of dizziness, the loss of his only son, who, he said, was "half his soul," a painful disease, and the natural progress of decay, all checked his pen, and at length made him almost silent, except when he was animated, for a time, by the impulse of intellectual society. In the end, he conversed with difficulty ; and on the seventh of June, 1779, at the age of fourscore, he breathed his last. His widow, whom he left to the charge of his friend, Bishop Hurd, survived him long, and was married a second time, to a Clergyman. Long before his death, he had founded his well-known Course of Lectures, to be delivered at Lincoln's Inn, in proof of the truth of Christianity, from the fulfilment of Prophecy. He sleeps at Gloucester ; and, though his image is not that of the evangelical shepherd, whom we love to contemplate, yet a writer so illustrious, a champion of Christianity so vigorous, a speculator so dauntless, yet not reckless, and a man so honest, though impetuous, choleric and arrogant, was certainly raised up by Providence, in an age of much unbelief, to assist in inspiring respect for the Word of God, and especially for those Prophecies which Infidels were ready to despise and deride.

In his seat sat, for the next two years, the son of his patron, the great Lord Hardwicke. Bishop James Yorke, was translated from St. David's, to Gloucester, and in 1781, the year when the first of all Sunday Schools was founded by Raikes, a gentleman of Gloucester, in that city, he was again translated to Ely.

The next Bishop, Samuel Hallifax, had high University distinctions and filled no inconsiderable place amongst the eminent men of his generation. He was the son of an Apothecary, in Derbyshire, was of Jesus College, Cambridge, and

obtained a Fellowship at Trinity Hall, which he did not relinquish till, at forty-two, he married. At one time he was Professor of Arabic ; but, devoting himself much to the Civil Law, was placed at the head of that department, and made Master of the Faculties in Doctors' Commons. His early acquaintance with the works of Bishop Butler, of which he was afterwards the editor, is mentioned by him as a blessing, for which he never ceased to be thankful to Providence. Three sermons on Subscription to Articles, which he preached before the University, in 1772, when that question was agitated, were very effective pieces of vehement, impassioned oratory ; and one of the great lawyers of the next age declared them the best specimens, which he had ever heard, of pulpit eloquence. He was marked, also, for his clear and flowing Latin. An "Analysis of the Civil Law" was his tribute to his Professorship ; and his Warburtonian Lectures were a valuable contribution to Theology. Like Warburton himself, and like Hurd and Newton, he recognized the Roman Apostasy, as a great theme of Prophecy, in the New Testament. He was also the editor of Ogden's Sermons, and had printed three of his own, on Justification by Faith. His wife was of Cambridge, the daughter of the quaint and classical Dean Cooke, of Ely, and the niece of Bishop Weston. The Marquis of Rockingham gave him the Living of Worksop, which he held as long as he lived. His powers in public speaking, his unassuming and courteous manners, his blameless and exemplary life, prepared him to be an honored and beloved Prelate ; and, after the See of Gloucester had been declined by Doctor Balguy, it was offered to him, and accepted. He entered the Episcopal mansion with the cares of a numerous family of young children, and the blessing of a virtuous wife ; resided there seven years ; and in 1788 was transferred to St. Asaph.

Horne Tooke, whose praise must have been at least somewhat impartial, pronounced the Master of Jesus College, Richard Beadon, "the chief ornament of the University of Cambridge, for virtue and talents." He was, at one time, Chancellor of St. David's, and afterwards Archdeacon of London. On the translation of Bishop Hallifax, he succeeded him

at Gloucester, and, thirteen years after, was made Bishop of Bath and Wells. He was married to a grand-daughter of Bishop Gooch, who had held the Sees of Bristol, Norwich, and Ely, in the preceding generation.

His successor had what was now, in the Episcopate, the distinction of celibacy. Born at Winchester, George Isaac Huntingford had gone from its instructions, of course, to New College, of which Winchester School is the Seminary; and returning, had become Fellow, and then Warden, of the School of his boyhood; and thus had passed his days in the still air of reverend cloisters and of classic studies. An introduction to the writing of Greek, and some Greek Odes of his own, with one or two other philological works, assured him a name amongst the scholars of Oxford; for, his language was simple and elegant, his illustrations learned and copious. In 1795, he published a volume of Sermons; and in 1800, a Call for Union with the Established Church, compiled from several writers. With candor and mildness, with piety and liberality, he presided at Gloucester, till 1815, when, at the age of sixty-seven, he accepted the adjoining Diocese of Hereford; having, till then, remained Rector of Corsley, in Wiltshire; for, the unhappy scale of expense which custom prescribed to the English Bishops, required, in the poorer Sees, such a junction, and prompted these frequent translations. His sight was imperfect, and he said to Parr, who honored his scholarship and his kindness, that, in the prosecution of his studies, he had "labored under many and heartbreaking disadvantages." The orphans of his brother were his adopted children, and the Episcopal Halls were sometimes cheered by youthful footsteps. Besides his Charges, in one of which he vindicated the Clergy, both "from the charge of not preaching the Gospel, and from the misapplied name of Methodists," and in another of which he explained the forms of Ordination and of Absolution, he also published, in 1804, terse and sententious "Thoughts on the Trinity," and in 1813, a "Protestant Letter."

The youngest brother of Lord Harrowby, Henry Ryder, was an accomplished and most amiable Clergyman, of that class, who, sometimes in honor and sometimes in scorn, were popu-

larly designated as "Evangelical," but of whom many deserved the name, for their evident and eminent adherence to the doctrines which make our religion "good tidings." Too long had the Episcopal bench been accustomed rather to restrain than to guide the more fervent men in the Ministry ; and his principles were deemed an obstacle to his elevation. But his brother was high in Office ; the Clergy of that class were numerous ; his qualifications for Episcopal efficiency were preëminent, and from the Deanery of Wells he passed to the Bishopric of Gloucester, at the age of thirty-eight. Through his mother, he was the grandson of Bishop Terrick ; and in Leicestershire, where he married, he had been beneficed at Claybrook and Lutterworth, once the Parish of Wickliffe. In a Visitation Sermon at Leicester, he had even objected to some of the principles which he afterwards avowed ; but he formed the acquaintance of the excellent Robinson, who "instructed him in the way of the Lord more perfectly." His birth aided him to a Prebend of Westminster, and a Canonry at Windsor ; but his pastoral zeal and diligence, and his impressive and affecting sermons, joined with a singular sweetness of manners, made his elevation welcome to many a pious heart. Even Doctor Parr, with whom doctrines had little weight, was moved by the character of Bishop Ryder : "there is," said he, "a halo of holiness about that man." His voice was soon heard in his Cathedral, where his pleasing countenance and simple elocution accorded with the flow of consoling truth, which won the love of his hearers. He was ever amongst the foremost at those annual meetings of the Bible and Church Missionary Societies, at which the heart was stirred, as by the sound of a trumpet. Most kind and yielding in all his intercourse, he was decided in matters of conscience ; and, presiding at Bath, at the formation of a Church Missionary Society, endured even the open affront of a written protest from the Archdeacon, read in his presence. In his first Charge, he suggested earnest self-examination ; urged a second Service on Sundays, then widely neglected ; and, while he protested against a perversion of his doctrine, wished that the term "Regeneration," might be generally limited to Baptism, with its "pledge of spiritual aid vouchsafed, and ready to offer itself

at the dawn of reason." The visitor of his Episcopal abode, in 1824, beheld him surrounded by a household which numbered thirteen children. In that year, he was moved to the more populous Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry, where his family were seated, and where the care of an active Diocesan was especially needful, after the administration of a very aged predecessor. His three parting Sermons at Gloucester, were printed; and a present of the 'Benedictine Fathers,' purchased by subscription throughout the Diocese, was a token of widespread affection.

He was succeeded by Christopher Bethell, Dean of Chichester. The son of a schoolmaster at Wallingford, Bethell became a member of King's College, Cambridge, and was there a competitor for the Craven Scholarship, against the future Bishop, Samuel Butler. In 1808, he became Rector of Kirby Wiske, in Yorkshire; and in 1816, he published "an Apology for the Ministers of the Church of England, who hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." The subject seems to have occupied his thoughts for many years; for, he also published a General View of the Doctrine; and, in a Charge in 1828, he urged, that the Clergy must not attempt to explain away, or accommodate the Baptismal Services. Still earlier, in his primary Charge, he insisted on strict conformity to the Rubrics, and to the doctrines of the Liturgy; objected to sermons by the advocates of general Societies; and protested, it should seem, against books of Hymns, which had been permitted by his predecessor, and were widely used, though without express authority, in the Church of England. Bishop Bethell had the bearing of a vigilant Diocesan, and an earnest Ecclesiastic, but was rather a subtle than a lucid thinker, and seemed to suppose in "Baptism," a certain physical process. After voting against the Roman Catholic Bill, he was, in 1830, translated to Exeter.

Almost at the head of a race of distinguished Greek scholars at Cambridge, stood James Henry Monk, now Dean of Peterborough. He was descended from Bentley, whose Life he wrote, and he succeeded to the Chair of Porson, whose posthumous Tracts he edited, with Bishop Blomfield. Several of the Tragedies of Euripides appeared, in careful editions, from his

hand, while he resided at Trinity College. In reply to Sir James Edward Smith, he vindicated the University, asserted the inferiority of Botanical studies, and maintained the necessity of excluding the Dissenters. He attained, in due time, a Prebend of Westminster, his Deanery, and the livings of Pea-kirk and Fiskerton. At Peterborough, he proposed, and greatly assisted the erection of the new Choir in the Cathedral. Candor, moderation, and a wise zeal, were characteristics of his Episcopal administration. He devoted one tenth of his revenue to his poorer brethren of the Clergy ; and he proposed, at Cambridge, a general examination in Religious knowledge. While he spoke against the Reform Bill, he yet exhorted his Clergy against being political partizans and agitators. He did not hesitate to become a member of the Ecclesiastical Commission, nor to give his name, as a Vice President, to the Temperance Society. After the city of Bristol, with the Deaneries of Cricklade and Malmesbury, in Wiltshire, were annexed to his Diocese, his title became that of Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol ; and, in 1840, he founded, at Bristol, the Bishop's College. His opposition to the Tractarian system was kind and charitable, but steadfast and fervent. He was a husband and a father ; and though, in 1837, he almost lost his power of vision, yet he was always found amongst the most careful watchmen over the British Israel.

ART. III.—INTRODUCTION OF GERMAN PHILOSOPHY
INTO THE UNITED STATES.

(1st.) *Aids to Reflection.* By SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.
New York : 1840.

(2d.) *Introduction to the History of Philosophy.* By VICTOR
COUSIN. Boston : 1832.

[Our object, in publishing the following Article, is to describe the origin, in this country, and the main features, of that system of Rationalistic Philosophy, which is upsetting modern Sectarian Creeds, and filling the land with a multiform, godless Infidelity.—ED.]

UNTIL within about forty years, the Empirical Philosophy, as taught by Locke and the Scotch writers, had dominion in nearly all our Colleges and Schools, and was regarded, everywhere, as the only true Philosophy. Berkeley's idealism was, indeed, received by a few ; and, if it did not originate, it doubtless helped to give currency to, that species of Pantheism which is fundamental in the theology of what is known as the Emmons School. Berkeley made immediate divine agency the sole cause of all the phenomena of the material world ; and Emmons extended the same immediate agency throughout the intellectual world. But neither of these very acute reasoners aimed to overthrow the empirical mode of philosophizing. The first only wished to strengthen the argument, from experience, for the being of a God, and the second, to reconcile the doctrines of Calvinism with a sound Philosophy.

A little less than forty years ago, the German language, and with it, German literature and science, began to be studied in this country ; and soon, here and there an individual was induced to look with some favor on German Philosophy. But the perfect novelty of its principles, and its strange terminology, rendered it almost unintelligible. Under these circumstances, the writings of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who had mastered and adopted some of the fundamental principles of Kant, found their way into the country, and were eagerly caught at

and read by several of the younger theologians. His *Biographia Literaria*, his work entitled *The Friend*, and his *Aids to Reflection*, found as warm admirers in this country as in England. In 1829, Pres. James Marsh, D. D., a Professor in Burlington, Vt., published an American edition of the *Aids to Reflection*, with an elaborate Preliminary Essay, vindicating and recommending the principles of the book. From that period, Coleridgeism has spread very considerably in New England. The *Biographia Literaria* of Coleridge, and his *Friend*, which we read hastily soon after their publication, are not now at hand, and we shall therefore confine our remarks to his *Aids to Reflection*.

This work is not so much a treatise on Philosophy, as a treatise on practical or experimental Religion, and was intended especially for the use of young men who are studying for the Ministry. Dr. Marsh well says: "It might rather be denominated a *philosophical statement and vindication of the distinctively spiritual and peculiar doctrines of the Christian System*." Coleridge was one of the most "Evangelical" men of his times in the English Church: and he supposed he could explain and establish, in the most satisfactory manner, the Religious doctrines which he held in common with Archbishop Leighton and the early Puritans, by means of those principles of the Kantian Philosophy which he had imbibed, and especially by means of what he calls *the momentous distinction between Reason and Understanding*. By means of this distinction, he thought he could establish, more clearly and precisely, the import of certain Scriptural terms, such as carnal, fleshly, spiritual, the flesh, the spirit, &c.; and likewise "establish the distinct characters of Prudence, Morality, and Religion;" and, finally, could shew the perfect harmony of "all the peculiar doctrines of the Christian Faith" with Reason or sound Philosophy.*

But Coleridge was a poet: and poets seldom write well on metaphysical subjects. Besides, he has justly been pronounced a turgid and obscure writer: and although, in his *Aids to Reflection*, he aims at a more chastened and simple style than in

* *Aids* &c., p. 62-64, ed. New York, 1840.

his other prose writings, yet he has preposterously employed, in this purely didactic work, *APHORISMS*, instead of logical definitions and fully developed arguments. He assumes that his readers know too much, or that they can understand him from a mere hint, a passing remark, a brilliant fragment of thought, without any full and clear delineation of his new theological views; and, like a genuine poet, he leaps *in medias res*, and throws out his new and strange ideas, without preparing our minds to receive them, or even to understand them. Thus the all-important distinction between Reason and Understanding, which is the basis of his whole system, but of which nine tenths of the reading public have no clear idea, is everywhere held up to view as fundamental, and yet is nowhere described or defined. And his learned editor, catching too much of his spirit, says, explicitly, (p. 46,) "What is the precise nature of the distinction between the Understanding and Reason, it is not my province, nor have I undertaken, to shew. My object is merely to illustrate its necessity." The consequence is, most readers of the book are utterly unable to comprehend it; and therefore, they strongly suspect the author was groping in darkness, or that he did not see clearly those shadowy objects which he would not venture to describe.

From the language and reasonings of Coleridge, as well as from his known partiality for German Philosophy, it is presumable that he adopted, substantially, its distinction between the Reason and Understanding. But Coleridge is principally concerned with *practical* Reason, or Reason in its relation to the Will, and to the moral actions of man; in which relation, Coleridge says, it is "the determinant of ultimate ends," that is, it is the source of those pure ideas of right, of duty, of moral obligation, which should be the supreme law of action to a rational being. In distinction from this faculty, the Understanding, considered as a principle of action, bears a striking resemblance to the Instinct of the more intelligent animals, the ant, the bee, the beaver, &c. It is the ability to select and apply fit means to proximate ends. Its views are limited to the object in immediate contemplation; and it is but another name for ingenuity, sagacity, practical judgment

in affairs, or the power of judging according to the maxims of experience.* Coleridge often calls it "the faculty of judging according to sense;" that is, according to empirical wisdom.

Now man, according to Coleridge, was endowed by his Creator with the faculties of Understanding and Reason, which he was to develop and employ in the fulfilment of his duties, as a creature of God. His Understanding was to supply in him the place of Instinct in the brutes; speculative Reason was to enable him to cultivate scientific knowledge; and practical Reason was to regulate and govern his moral conduct, or to enable him to yield rational obedience to the laws of his Creator. But, by the apostasy, in which all participate as soon as they become capable of moral action, the Will of man divorces itself from practical Reason, and submits to the control of the Understanding and the natural propensities. By so doing, fallen man turns away from those high and pure principles of right, of duty, of moral obligation, which should be his ultimate aims, and fixes his regards on approximate ends, or, in the language of an Apostle, on "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." He practically, if not also theoretically, discards the idea of there being anything higher or more excellent than personal enjoyment, or individual happiness: and in determining what will make him happy, or what is his supreme good, he recurs to experience, as the best and the proper criterion. Thus, by following his Understanding as his only guide, fallen man is selfish and earthly-minded, until, by the new birth, practical Reason is restored to her throne in the soul.

But, for the full understanding of this subject, the wide difference between *nature* and *free Will* must not be overlooked: for, as Dr. Marsh says, "The key to his system will be found in the distinctions which he makes and illustrates, between Nature and free Will, and between the Understanding and Reason.†" Throughout the kingdom of *nature*, according to Coleridge, one universal law prevails, and has absolute control. It is that of the *necessary dependence* of one thing on another, or the *law of cause and effect*. To this law, not only all mate-

* See Aids &c., p. 241, note; and page 353.

† See Aids &c., p. 17.

rial bodies, but all vegetable and animal life, and all the sensitive and elective faculties, both of brutes and of man's animal nature, are entirely subject. But the *free Will* of a rational being, in his opinion, is not subject to this law. It acts spontaneously, and independently of any causation from without. It is not controlled by *motives*, as the proper causes of its elections: "The man makes the motive, and not the motive the man." (p. 106.) Now, when the Will renounces its allegiance to practical Reason, and subjects itself to the guidance of the Understanding and the natural propensities, it renounces its high and spiritual character, and consents to become, as it were, a part of nature; and thus the whole man becomes carnal, earthly, selfish, and scarcely superior to the brutes, so far as the discharge of his duties and obligations, as a creature of God, is concerned. And this is the radical principle of sin, or depravity, in fallen man, or what the Scriptures denominate, the flesh, the carnal mind, and the minding the things of the flesh. And consequently, the recovery of man from this sinful state, is, making him spiritual, or spiritually minded; it is, exciting his debased and degraded Will to renounce its subjection to sense and to the Understanding, and be obedient to the commands of practical Reason, or to the law of right, of duty, of moral obligation. Now, both Scripture and experience show, that when the Will has been long enslaved to sense, its energies are paralyzed, and Divine aid or supernatural Grace is necessary to restore it to sound and healthy action. Besides, the guilt incurred by a course of criminal disobedience to the law of God, presents an additional obstacle to the restoration of the sinner to the favorable regards of his Creator. And hence the necessity of a Divine Redeemer for fallen man, a Redeemer Who can act both *on* and *in* the Will, and can stand up as a Mediator between God and sinful man.*

Coleridge has, moreover, taken much pains to ascertain the precise import of the terms, Prudence, Morality, and Spiritual Religion. *Prudence*, he says, has for its chief organs the senses and the understanding. Its sole aim is, the advancement of

*See Aids &c., p. 297, &c.

our personal interest or well-being ; and it is especially careful to guard against everything that may do us harm, frustrate our plans, or mar our happiness. *Morality* has, for its chief organ, the heart, or the natural affections and sympathies of our nature ; and it seeks the happiness of others, because we find pleasure in doing so. *Spiritual Religion* has for its organs, free Will and practical Reason ; and its sole aim is, to make the whole conduct of the man to harmonize with the Divine Law. From these definitions, it is manifest that a man may have and may exhibit much prudence and much morality, and yet be entirely destitute of *Spiritual Religion*.

Such, according to Coleridge, are some of the radical principles of Mental Philosophy ; and these philosophers claim that they are of very high importance to the right understanding and the vindication of the peculiar doctrines and precepts of Christianity. They give us clear and just conceptions of the apostasy of man, of both original and actual sin, of that carnal mind which is enmity against God, because it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be ; and hence, also, of that Redemption which is by Jesus Christ, of Regeneration by Divine Grace, and of that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. Not that this Philosophy, or any other, is competent to teach us, originally, all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, or to demonstrate their truth, without the aid of Revelation. But when these momentous truths are revealed to us, they say, that this Philosophy enables us to comprehend them, and to see that they are reasonable, and are worthy of all acceptance, as coming from God.

That species of German Philosophy, which has sprung up among the Unitarian Clergy of Massachusetts, and which was advocated especially in a Periodical called the *Dial*, is known by the appellation, TRANSCENDENTALISM. The propriety, however, of the appellation, may be questioned. KANT, who, so far as we know, first brought the term Transcendental into Philosophy, would certainly not apply it to this or to any similar system. He would denominate it TRANSCENDENT, not Transcendental. The difference, according to his views, is immense. Both terms, indeed, denote the *surpassing* or tran-

scending of certain limits ; but the limits surpassed are entirely different. That is called *Transcendental*, which surpasses the limits of sensible or empirical knowledge, and expatiates in the region of pure thought or absolute science. It is, therefore, truly scientific ; and it serves to explain empirical truths, so far as they are explicable. On the other hand, that is called *Transcendent*, which not only goes beyond empiricism, but surpasses the boundaries of human knowledge. It expatiates in the shadowy region of imaginary truth. It is, therefore, falsely called Science : it is the opposite of true Philosophy. According to the Critical Philosophy, all speculations in Physical Science, that attempt to go beyond phenomena, and all speculations on supersensible things, which attempt to explain their essential nature, are *transcendent* ; that is, they overleap the boundaries of human knowledge. In violation of these canons, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, plunged headlong into such speculations, and yet called them *Transcendental* ; and the new German Philosophers of Massachusetts follow their example.

Waiving, however, this misnomer,—as every real Kantian must regard it,—we will call this philosophy *Transcendental* ; since its advocates choose to call it so, and seeing the name has become current in our country. And we will first inquire into its origin among us, and then proceed to notice its prominent characteristics.

According to their own representations, the believers in this Philosophy are Unitarian Clergymen, who had, for some time, been dissatisfied with the Unitarian system of Theology. They tell us, they found it to be a meagre, uninteresting system, which did not meet the religious wants of the community. While laboring to improve their system of Theology, or to find a better, they cast their eyes on foreign countries. There they discovered a different Philosophy prevailing ; a Philosophy which, they say, gives an entirely new version to Christianity, invests it with a more spiritual character, with more power to move the soul, to call forth warm emotions, and to produce communion with God. This Philosophy they have now embraced. Such, they inform us, was the origin of Transcenden-

talism among them.—But it may be more satisfactory to give their own statements on this head.

The Rev. G. RIPLEY, or whoever composed the long anonymous letter to Professor Norton, on his Discourse before the Alumni of the Cambridge Theological School, in 1839, says, (pages 11, 12):—

“In our happy state of society, as there is no broad line of distinction between the Clergy and the rest of the community, they [the Alumni] had shared in the influences, which, within the last few years, have acted so strongly on the public mind: with intelligent and reflecting men of every pursuit and persuasion, many of them have been led to feel the *necessity* of a more thorough *reform in Theology*: they were not satisfied, that the denial of the Trinity, and its kindred doctrines, gave them possession of all spiritual truth: they wished to press forward in the course which they had begun, to ascend to higher views, to gain a deeper insight into Christianity, to imbibe more fully its divine spirit, and to apply the truths of revelation to the wants of society, and the progress of man. Their experience, as pastors, had brought them into contact with a great variety of minds, some of which were dissatisfied with the traditions they had been taught; the religion of the day seemed *too cold, too lifeless, too mechanical*, for many of their flock; they were called to settle difficulties in Theology, of which they had not been advised in the school; objections were presented by men of discernment and acuteness, which could not be set aside by the learning of books; it was discovered, that many had become unable to rest their religious faith on the foundation of a *material philosophy*, viz., [the empirical philosophy of Locke,] and that a new direction must be given to their ideas, or they would be lost to Christianity, and possibly to virtue. The wants of such minds could not be concealed,” &c. . . . “In the course of the inquiries which they had entered into, for their own satisfaction and the good of their people, they had become convinced of the superiority of the testimony of the *soul* to the evidence of the *external senses*; the essential character of Christianity, as a principle of *spiritual faith*, of reliance on the Universal Father,” &c.

The Rev. O. A. BROWNSON, [now an Ultra-Montanist,] in his Charles Elwood, (Boston: 1840, p. 261,) says:—

“It cannot have escaped general observation, that religion, for some time, has failed to exert that influence over the mind and heart that it should. There is not much open skepticism, not much avowed infidelity, but there is a vast amount of *concealed doubt*, and *untold difficulty*. Few, very few among us, but ask for more certain evidence of the Christian faith than they possess. Many, many are the confessions to this effect, which I have received from men and women, whose religious character stands fair in the eyes of the church. I have been

told by men of unquestionable piety, that the only means they have to maintain their belief, even in God, is never to suffer themselves to inquire into the grounds of that belief. The moment they ask for proofs, they say, they begin to doubt. Our churches are but partially filled, and the majority of those, who attend them, complain that they are not fed."—"Surely, then, it is time to turn Christianity over, and see if it have not a side which we have not hitherto observed. Perhaps, when we come to see it on another side, in a new light, it will appear unto us more beautiful, and have greater power to attract our love and reverence."

The Rev. R. W. EMERSON, in his Address to the Senior Theological Class, at Cambridge, in 1838, says, (p. 17.) :—

"It is my duty to say to you, that the *need was never greater of a new revelation* than now. From the views I have already expressed, you will infer the sad conviction, which I have, I believe, with numbers, of the *universal decay*, and now *almost death*, of faith in society. The soul is not preached. The church seems to *totter to its fall*, almost all life extinct."

Again, (p. 24,) he says :—

"I think no man can go, with his thoughts about him, into one of our churches, without feeling, that what hold the public worship once had on men, is gone or going. It has lost its grasp on the affection of the good, and the fear of the bad. In the country neighborhoods, half parishes are *signing off*,—to use the local term."

And, (on p. 21,) he says :—

"The *prayers*, and even the *dogmas* of our church, are like the zodiac of Denderah, and the astronomical instruments of the Hindoos, wholly insulated from anything now extant in the life and business of the people. They mark the height to which the waters once rose."

For the perfect accuracy of these statements, we cannot vouch from our own personal knowledge. Nor are they here adduced to prove the actual state of the Unitarian congregations, but simply to show how defective the Transcendentalists consider the Unitarian theology, and, of course, the grounds of *their* dissatisfaction with it.

The author of an elaborate and highly interesting Article in the Dial, for April, 1841, entitled The Unitarian Movement in New England, has given a very philosophical account of the origin of the Unitarian community in this country, as well as

of the recent rise of the Sect of Transcendentalists in that community. According to this able writer, the doctrine of the Trinity, and the connected doctrines of man's deep-rooted depravity, and his dependence on Divine Grace for a recovery to holiness and happiness, will admit of a satisfactory explanation and vindication, only on the principles of the Platonic, or (as we have called it) the Metaphysical Philosophy. On the principles of the sensuous or empirical philosophy, as he supposes, a Trinity in the Godhead is an absurdity, and the connected doctrines mysterious and inexplicable. But, as is well known, from the days of Locke, this latter philosophy held the ascendancy ; or, rather, it was, until quite recently, the only Philosophy known in the country. While addicted to such a Philosophy, these theologians could not reason closely on the Articles of their Faith, without meeting with difficulties and perplexities : and they were in great danger of falling into different opinions respecting the Christian doctrines. At the same time, the Orthodox Creeds forbade any deviation from the established faith. The result was, that those most given to free inquiry, fell into Unitarianism, and the doctrines connected with that system. Thus originated, according to this writer, the Unitarian movement in New England : for he says, expressly, (page 431.) :—

“ We regard it [Unitarianism] as the result of an attempt to explain Christianity by the sensual Philosophy, instigated by a desire to get rid of mystery, and to make everything clear and simple.”

The proximate causes of the rise of Transcendentalism among the Unitarians, are thus described by this writer, (p. 422—3 :)

“ The Unitarian movement disenthralled the minds of men, and bade them wander, wheresoever they might list, in search of truth, and to rest in whatsoever views their own consciences might approve. The attention of our students was then called to the literature of Foreign countries.—They wished to see how went the battle against sin and error there. They soon found a different philosophy in vogue, and one, which seemed to explain the facts of their own experience and observation more to their satisfaction than the one they had been accustomed to meet in their books. In most cases, the pleasure of the discovery was heightened by the fact, that these men, in their previous inquiries, had come to the same or similar conclusions. In some cases, they had been too diffident to express them, while in oth-

ers, the expression of them had called forth manifest indications of disapprobation, if not of open persecution."

The concluding sentences in this quotation shew, that the Transcendentalists, before they became acquainted with foreign Philosophy, were not satisfied with the Unitarian system of Theology; and that some of them had, at that time, arrived at nearly their present theological views, the expression of which then met the disapprobation, if not the open persecution, of the staunch Unitarians.—The inconsistency of the Unitarian body in advocating unlimited freedom of inquiry, and then censuring the Transcendentalists for practising it, is severely rebuked in the following passage, (p. 434) :—

"They have made a great movement in favor of freedom of inquiry, and thoroughness, and fearlessness of investigation; and now, like the witch of Endor, they seem terrified at the spirit they have called up. This would seem to indicate, that the movement in favor of freedom and liberty was not the offspring of pure, disinterested love of truth and principle."

The defects of the Unitarian theology are described by this able writer, in the following terms, (p. 436) :—

"Unitarians make Christianity too plain,—plainer than, from the very nature of the case, it can possibly be."—"There is, moreover, a degree of religious experience, that Unitarianism fails to satisfy." [Page 438]: "Unitarianism is sound, sober, good sense. But the moment a preacher rises to eloquence, he rises out of his system." [Page 440]: "We think, that in its principles and logical tendency, it is *allied* to the most barren of all systems."

None of the Transcendentalists of this country are Philosophers by profession. Nearly all of them are Clergymen, of the Unitarian school; and their habits of thought, their feelings, and their aims, are manifestly theological. Nor do they give us proof that they have devoted very great attention to Philosophy, as a Science. They have produced, we believe, no work professedly on the subject, not even an elementary treatise; and, if we do not mistake, they have brought forward no new views or principles in Philosophy. So far as we can judge, they have merely taken up the Philosophy of Victor Cousin, and, after comparing it, according to their opportunity, with that of the more recent German schools, have modified a little

some of its dicta, and applied them freely to scientific and practical Theology. At the same time, they take little pains to elucidate and explain the principles of their new Philosophy. They address us, as if we all read and understood their favorite Cousin, and were not ignorant of the speculations of the German Pantheists: and their chief aim seems to be, to shew us how much better this Gallo-Germanic Philosophy explains the Religion of Nature, and of the Bible, than the old Philosophy of Locke and the Scottish school. Whoever, therefore, would understand the Transcendental writers, must first understand, if he can, the French philosopher, Cousin, and the German Pantheists.

Cousin maintains, that, by taking a higher point of observation, he has brought all previous systems of Philosophy to harmonize with each other.* He therefore adopts, and uses at pleasure, the peculiar phraseology of all the systems, as being all suited to express his own new views. This causes his writings to exhibit, not only great variety, but, apparently, if not really, great inconsistency of terminology. And hence different persons, aiming to follow him as a guide, may easily mistake his meaning, and adopt different principles; or, if they adopt the same principles, they may express themselves in a very different manner. And, if we suppose the same persons, with only a moderate share of philosophic learning and philosophic tact, to attempt to re-construct the Philosophy of Cousin, by comparing it with the German Systems from which it is taken, and at the same time to adopt Cousin's lax use of language; we may easily conceive, what confusion of thought and obscurity of statement may appear on their pages. Now the Transcendentalists, if we do not mistake, have thus followed Cousin. Of course, they differ considerably from one another; some following Cousin more closely, and others leaning more towards some German; some preferring one set of Cousin's terms, and others another, or coining new ones, to suit their fancy. After all, Linberg's translation of Cousin's Introduction to the History of Philosophy, may be considered as the great store-house, from which most of them—e. g., Brownson, Emerson, Parker,

* See his *Introd. to Hist. of Phil.*, by Linberg, page 414.

&c.—have derived their peculiar philosophical opinions, their modes of reasoning, and their forms of thought and expression.

The radical principle of the Transcendental philosophy, the corner-stone of the whole edifice, is Cousin's doctrine, that *Spontaneous Reason* acquaints us with the true and essential nature of things. According to this doctrine, Reason, when uncontrolled by the Will, or when left free to expatiate, undirected and uninfluenced by the voluntary faculty, always apprehends things as they are, or has direct and absolute knowledge of the objects of its contemplation. This *clairvoyance* of Reason, Cousin calls, "an instinctive perception of truth, an entirely instinctive development of thought,"—"an original, irresistible, and unreflective perception of truth," "pure apperception, and spontaneous faith,"—"the absolute affirmation of truth, without reflection,—inspiration,—veritable revelation."* The characteristics of this kind of knowledge, as being *immediate*, and *infallible*, though not always perfectly distinct at first, and as being *Divine*, or as coming from God, either directly or indirectly, all Transcendentalists maintain. But in what manner, or by what mode of action, our Reason acquires this knowledge, they do not distinctly inform us. Whether our Creator has endowed us with an intellectual *instinct*, a power of rational intuition; or whether the rational soul, as itself partaking of the Divine nature, has this *inherent sagacity* in and of itself; or whether the Divine Being, God Himself, is always present in the soul, and acting in it by way of *inspiration*, these philosophers seem not to have decided. They use terms, however, which fairly imply each and all of these hypotheses, and especially the last. But however undecided on this point, which is of so much importance in a philosophic view, on the general fact that all rational beings do possess this knowledge, they are very explicit; and some of them attempt to prove it, by reasoning from the necessity of such knowledge to us, and from the current belief of mankind.†

The effects of this principle, when carried into Theology,

* Introd., &c., pages 163, 167, 172, 166.

† See Cousin's Psychology, Chap. vi., and a writer in the Dial, Vol. II., page 86, &c.

are immense. It dispels all mysteries and all obscurities from this most profound of all Sciences, and gives to Human Reason, absolute dominion over it. For it makes the Divine Being, His government and laws, and our relations to Him, and all our religious obligations and interests,—every part of Theology, theoretical or practical,—perfectly comprehensible to our Reason, in its spontaneous operation. It makes all the doctrines of *Natural Religion*, the objects of our direct, intuitive knowledge: we need no explanations, and no confirmations from any books or teachers; we have only to listen to the voice of spontaneous Reason, or to the teachings of our own souls, the light that shines within us, and all will be perfectly intelligible and absolutely certain. And hence, we need no *External Revelation*, no inspired teacher, to solve our doubts and difficulties, or to make any part of natural religion, or any principle of moral duty, either more plain, or more certain. We are, all of us, prophets of God, all inspired through our Reason, and we need no one to instruct and enlighten us. The great Seers of ancient times, Moses and the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, were no otherwise inspired than we all are; they only cultivated and listened to spontaneous Reason, more than ordinary men; and this enabled them to see further, and to speak and write, better than other men, on religious subjects. If we would determine whether the *Bible* was written by inspired men, we need not pore upon the so-called External Evidences, Miracles, Prophecies, &c., but merely listen to the testimony of our own souls, the teachings of spontaneous Reason, or what is called the Internal Evidence, and we shall at once see the clear and infallible marks of Inspiration. And, to *understand the Bible*, we need no aid from learned interpreters. Only give us the book in a language we can read, and the suggestions of our own inspired minds will enable us to comprehend, perfectly, the import of every sentence, and to see clearly what is Divine, and what is human, or what originated from spontaneous Reason, and what from human infirmity, in the Holy Scriptures. And, of course, every man is competent to decide, definitely and infallibly, all the controversies among theologians, and all the disputes between different sects of Christians,

respecting the *Doctrines taught in the Bible*. In short, not only the profound researches of philologists, antiquarians, and biblical commentators, but, also, the elaborate discussions of didactic theologians, polemic, apologetic, and metaphysical, are all of little or no value in Theology. Instead of depending on them, the theological inquirer should rather retire to solitude and silence, and, while musing on religious subjects, with the Bible and the Book of Nature before him, he should refrain from giving any determinate direction to his thoughts, and, allowing them to flow on spontaneously, he should listen to the voice of Reason, as she expatiates freely in the open field of visions; then he will be caught up, as it were, to the third heaven, and will see all that the inspired prophets saw; his knowledge will be superhuman and Divine.

But to understand more fully the metaphysics of the Transcendental writers, we must not overlook their *Ontological* doctrines. If Reason acquaints us with the true and essential nature of all things, then the field of Ontology is open fully to our inspection, and we may form there a perfectly solid and safe science. Accordingly, all Transcendentalists, on both sides of the Atlantic, assume some system of Ontology, as the basis of their speculations. The prevailing system among the modern Germans, and that to which Cousin and his American followers assent, is *Pantheistic*: that is, it resolves the universe into one primordial Being, who develops Himself in various finite forms: in other words, it supposes God, and the developments of God, to be the only real existences, the *το παν*, the entire universe.

But when they attempt to explain this general statement, the Germans bring forward different hypotheses. Some, following *Spinoza*, invest the primordial Being with the essential attributes of both a substance and a person; and they suppose Him to create from Himself, or to form, out of His own substance, all rational and sentient beings, and all material things. Others, with *Schelling*, suppose Him to be, originally, neither a person nor a substance, but the elementary principle of both, which, in developing itself, becomes first a person and a substance, and then a universe of beings and things. Others

follow *Hegel*, and adopt a system of pure *idealism*. They suppose concrete ideas to be the only real existences, and the logical genesis of ideas to be the physical genesis of the universe. Take the simple idea of existence, and abstract from it everything conceivable, so that it shall become evanescent; and, in that evanescent state, while fluctuating between something and nothing, it is the primitive, the generative principle of all things. For it is the most comprehensive, or generical of all ideas, including all other ideas under it, as subordinate genera and species; and, therefore, when expanded, or drawn out into the subordinate genera and species, it becomes the *το παν*, the universe of beings and things.

Vacillating among all these theories, especially between the two last, and trying to amalgamate them all in one, Cousin, without exhibiting any very definite ideas, merely declares the Infinite to be the primitive, and all that is finite, to be derivative from the Infinite, while yet both the Infinite and the finite are so inseparable, that neither can exist without the other. The appellation, *Pantheists*, it appears, is unacceptable to Cousin, and to most of his American followers; but some of the latter voluntarily assume it; and they unscrupulously apply it to all Transcendentalists. That the doctrines of the Transcendentalists, as well as those of Spinoza, Schelling, and Hegel, are really and truly *Pantheistic*, appears from the fact, that they all hold to but *one essence*, or *one substance*, in the universe. They expressly deny, that God created or produced the world *out of nothing*, or that He gave existence to beings and things, the substance and matter of which had no previous existence: they say, He created or brought forth the world *from Himself*, or formed it out of *His own substance*; and, also, that He still exists in the created universe, and the created universe in Him, thus constituting an *absolute unity*, as to essence or substance. That the epithet *Pantheistic*, may properly be applied to such doctrines, seems not to be deniable.*

As Pantheists, the Transcendentalists must behold God, or the Divine nature and essence, in everything that exists. Of

* See Krug's Philos. Lexikon; Art. *Pantheismus*.

course, none of them can ever doubt the *existence of God*, or be in the least danger of Atheism ; for they cannot believe anything to exist, without finding God in it : they see Him, they feel Him, they have sensible perception of His very substance in every object around them. Moreover, if our souls are only portions of the Divinity, if they are, really, God working in us, then there is solid ground for the belief, that *spontaneous Reason* always sees the true nature of things, or has Divine knowledge of the objects of its contemplation.

And, again, if it is the Divine Nature, which lives and acts in all creatures and things, then, all *their action* is *Divine action*. All created intelligences think, and feel, and act, as God acts in them ; and, of course, precisely as He would have them. There can, then, be nothing *wrong*, nothing *sinful*, in the character and conduct of any rational being. There may be imperfection, or imperfect action, because the whole power of God is not exerted ; but every act, so far as it goes, is just what it should be, just such as best pleases God. And hence, though men may sigh over their imperfections, or may ardently desire and strive to become more perfect, yet they can have no reason for *repentance*, for sorrow, and shame, and self-condemnation, for anything they have done, or have omitted to do. Neither can they feel themselves to need any radical *change of character*, to make them acceptable to God ; or any *Redeemer*, to rescue them from impending perdition. All they need, is, to foster the Divinity within, to give it more full scope, and more perfect action ; then they will become all that it is possible they should be, and all they can reasonably desire.

These inferences from their principles, are not palmed upon Transcendentalists by their adversaries, but are admitted and defended by their ablest writers. Says one of them, whom we have before quoted,*—

“Holding, as they do, but one essence of all things, which essence is God, Pantheists must deny the existence of essential Evil. All evil is negative,—it is imperfection, non-growth. It is not essential, but modal. Of course, there can be no such thing as hereditary sin,—a tendency positively sinful in the soul. Sin is not a wilful trans-

* Dial, Vol. I., pages 423-4.

gression of a righteous Law, but the difficulty and obstruction which the Infinite meets with, in entering into the finite. *Regeneration* is nothing but an ingress of God into the soul, before which sin disappears, as darkness before the rising sun. Pantheists hold also to the *Atonement*, or at-one-ment, between the soul and God. This is strictly a unity, or *oneness of essence*, to be brought about by the incarnation of the spirit of God, [in man,] which is going on in us, as we grow in holiness. As we grow wise, just, and pure,—in a word, holy,—we grow to be one with Him in mode, as we always were in essence. This atonement is effected by *Christ*, only in as far as He taught the manner in which it was to be accomplished more fully than any other, and gave us a better illustration of the method and result in His own person, than any one else that has ever lived."

ART. IV.—AUTHORITY OF THE CANONS OF THE FIRST
FOUR ŒCUMENICAL SYNODS.

- (1.) *An Essay "De Antiquis Collectionibus et Collectoribus Canonum,"* in tom. III. of the Ballerini edition of the Works of Pope Leo I., (Leonis Magni Opera,) page V., et seq.
- (2.) *Bishop Beveridge's Συνόδικον, sine Pandectae Canonum SS. Apost. et Concil. ab Eccl. Græca receptorum,* etc. Oxford: 1672. Two tom. folio.
- (3.) *Canons of the Church,* translated by the Rev. WILLIAM ANDREW HAMMOND, M. A., of Christ Church, Oxford. New York: A. D., 1844.
- (4.) *The Concilia of Mansi, Hardouin, Baluze, Coleti,* and the Indexes to the three last, under "Canon" "Concilia."
- 5.) *The Πηδάλιον of the Eastern Church,* Athens edition of A. D., 1841. Its full Title is, "Rudder of the intellectual ship, the One, Holy, Universal, (καθολικῆς,) and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox."
- (6.) *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων.* Athens, 1852-1859: 6 vols. by RALLE and POTLE.

Nos. 1 and 4 are by Latins, Nos. 2 and 3 by Anglicans, and Nos. 5 and 6 by Greeks.

IN treating of the subject of the binding authority of the Œcumenical Canons, we invite attention:

- I. To what the Œcumenical Canons really are.
- II. We propose to show the authority given them by the Universal Church.
- III. Their ancient and present authority in the Eastern Church.
- IV. Their former authority in the Western Church.
- V. That they were enforced in ancient times even by the Civil Law.
- VI. To set forth certain authoritative documents of the An-

glican Communion, which bear, to a certain extent, on our subject.

And, VII., to answer some popular objections to obeying the Œcumenical Canons.

I. We are to state what the Œcumenical Canons are.

There have been only six Synods, which can be deemed Œcumenical, and, at the same time, orthodox. This number is recognized by the Church of England, in the Second Part of the Homily against Peril of Idolatry. For it speaks of them, as "those Six Councils, which were allowed and received of all men," and this expression occurs in that Book of the Homilies, of which the Church of England, and the American Church in their Thirty-Fifth Article, teach that it "doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times,"—and, therefore, the English Church, in the same Article, orders them "to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people." Now, from this, it is as clear as the sunlight, that both the Church of England and the American Church, do, in general terms, regard as authoritative, the Six Synods.

Moreover, the English Church not only thus speaks of them in the Homily, but also places her imprimatur on them, in the words which we have cited, to be read to all her people, that they may understand her utterance regarding them.

These six Councils are :

I. Nicæa, A. D. 325.

II. Constantinople, A. D. 381.

III. Ephesus, A. D. 431.

IV. Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

V. Constantinople, A. D. 553.

VI. Constantinople, A. D. 680.

But the last two made no Canons. So that all the *Œcumenical* Canons must be in the first Four, and in what local Synods they approved. The first three, that is, the Œcumenical Councils of Nicæa, I Constantinople, and Ephesus, made Canons, but did not add any Canons of any *local Synod* to the Œcumenical code. But the Fourth Œcumenical Synod, that is, Chalcedon, both made Canons of its own, and gave Œcu-

menical sanction to the Canons of the five local Councils of Ancyra, Neo-Cæsarea, Gangra, Antioch, and Laodiceæ.* Before Chalcedon, these Canons had only mere local authority. But Chalcedon invested them with universal sway, like any other Œcumenical Canons. The four Œcumenical Synods, and the five local Synods just mentioned, give us all the Œcumenical Law which we possess. In no other Canons but these does the Universal Church, the authority commissioned by Christ, utter her mandates. *Six, therefore, is the number which she receives.* The only other Synods which could claim even the shadow of Œcumenical sanction are, the Quinisext Synod, A. D. 691, and the Second Synod of Nicæa, held A. D. 783, (al. 787,) which the Orthodox Greeks and the Latins recognize as the Seventh.

But the Latins have never thoroughly received the Quinisext, or the other, in all their parts, and therefore they cannot be said ever to have had the assent of the undivided Church, East and West. And what is very important, and most germane to our subject, is, that their *Canons* have *never* been received in the West,—and the Quinisext had to do only with Canons. For it was assembled, not on account of Doctrinal controversy, but merely to make law,—and the Second of Nicæa, termed by the Greeks and the Latins, the Seventh Œcumenical Synod, was not universally received, when held. For many in the East opposed it, and it was condemned, with the Image Worship which it made obligatory, by the Council of Frankfort, A. D. 794, which Council, composed of 300 Bishops, represented the Britons, and the Empire of Charlemagne, namely, Germany, France, Aquitain, Spain, and part of Italy.†

Moreover, and what is very important for an Anglican, is the fact that the English Church, and the American Church, in the very same Second Part of the Homily against Peril of Idolatry, in which they receive “those Six Councils, which were allowed and received of all men,” expressly speak of the

* On this, see Canon I. of Chalcedon, and the Notes on it in the works mentioned at the head of this Article, and the remarks, pp. 148, 149, in Hammond's *Canons of the Church*,—on “The Canons of the Provincial Councils received into the Code of the Universal Church.”

† See references in Murdock's *Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.*, Vol. II., p. 42, Note 29.

decision of the Pseudo Seventh Council, as "Idolatry;" and, moreover, it ascribes the Saracen and Turkish conquests to obedience to the doctrine of Image Worship, which that falsely styled Seventh Œcumenical Council sanctioned. Its language is very strong, as any can see by glancing over it. After enumerating the Mussulman scourge, and comparing it to God's scourge on his ancient people, the Israelites, by the Assyrians and Babylonians, and after ascribing all these curses to the same sin of Image Worship and Idolatry, it says, that "mischief and misery hath, by occasion of the said images, fallen upon whole Christendom, besides the loss of infinite souls, which is most horrible of all."

So that, to come to a conclusion on this part of our subject, 1, the Anglican and American Churches do hold, as authoritative, the Six Synods named above. And, 2, they condemn the so called Seventh. But, in these Six Synods, the Universal Church speaks with the promised aid of the Holy Ghost. This will serve to explain what Canons are Œcumenical, and to state this was our first point.

We come now, II., to show the authority given by the Universal Church, to the Canons of the first four Œcumenical Councils. They are, as has been said, the *only* Laws of the Universal Church. A Father, however eminent, gives but his own historical testimony, or his own opinion. But he is amenable to the Universal Church, in the only place in which, as the Universal Church, she speaks; that is, in an Œcumenical Synod. An individual opinion of one Father, and of a large part of the Church, has passed under her investigation, and has been condemned. We refer to the opinion of St. Cyprian as to the invalidity of *all* Baptism administered by Heretics.*

*There is considerable doubt, as to whether St. Stephen, Bishop of Rome, the opponent of St. Cyprian, held that the Baptism of *all* heretics is valid, or only that of *some* of them. If he held the former opinion, the Œcumenical Synod of Nicæa, in its Nineteenth Canon, and the second Œcumenical Synod, in its Seventh, have certainly condemned him. See, on this matter, Mosheim's Commentaries on the History of Christianity in the first three Centuries, translated, Murdock's edition, New York: 1851, p. 89, et seq., of Vol. II.; and compare Poole's St. Cyprian, and the able work of Bishop Beveridge, the greatest of Anglican Canonists, entitled Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Primitivæ Vindicatus ac Illustratus, lib. II., cap vi., and xii., and the *Πηγάδιον*, and the *Σύνταγμα* on Apostolical Canons 46, 47, 49 and 50.

The Œcumenical Synod of Nicæa, A. D. 325, approved his opinion, so far as to decide the Baptism of the Paulianists invalid; it so far condemned it, as to deem the Baptism of the Cathari, that is, Novatians, valid.

Moreover, not only the most eminent individual Father, but the Bishop highest in rank, is amenable to an Œcumenical Synod, equally with the humblest Presbyter. Thus the Sixth Œcumenical Synod, actually condemned, as Monothelite Heretics, occupants of the four greatest Patriarchal thrones. It speaks thus:—

“The holy and Œcumenical Synod further says, . . . as the Author of Evil, who, in the beginning, availed himself of the aid of the serpent, and by it brought the poison of death upon the human race, has not desisted, but in like manner now, having found suitable instruments for working out his will, (we mean Theodorus, who was Bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, who were presidents of this imperial city,* and, moreover, Honorius who was Pope of the elder Rome, Cyrus Bishop of Alexandria, Macarius who was lately president of Antioch, and Stephen, his disciple,) has actively employed them in raising up for the whole Church the stumbling-blocks of one will and one operation in the two natures of Christ, our true God, one of the Holy Trinity; thus disseminating, in novel terms, amongst the Orthodox people, AN HERESY similar to the mad and wicked doctrine of the impious Apollinarius, Severus, and Themistius, and endeavoring craftily to destroy the perfection of the incarnation of the same our Lord Jesus Christ, our God, by blasphemously representing His flesh endowed with a rational soul, as devoid of will or operation.”†

Now, the remarkable thing about this whole decision is, that it condemns, as instruments of the Devil, and as guilty of the Monothelite “heresy,” and of blasphemous conduct, four Patriarchs of Constantinople, namely, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter; one Patriarch, or Pope of Rome, namely, Honorius; one Patriarch, or Pope of Alexandria, namely, Cyrus; and one Patriarch of Antioch, namely, Macarius. That is, an Œcumenical Synod arraigned before its supreme tribunal, the doctrinal teachings of the Bishops of the four chief Sees, and damns them for heresy. So much above every other au-

* This refers to Constantinople, where the Council was then sitting.

† Hammond's translation, except that we have substituted the more accurate “imperial,” for “royal,” before “city.”

thority is that of a Synod of the Universal Church, East and West ; and this is the truth which it concerns us to remember most on this subject ; and this is it which we are striving to set forth, not in our own words, but in the voice of the Universal Church herself, whose utterances we have just quoted.

The binding authority of the Œcumenical Canons is set forth, first, authoritatively, by the Six Œcumenical Synods themselves. This is *the authority*. Secondly, That binding authority is *witnessed* to by Local Synods and by Fathers.

And, first, as to the utterances of Œcumenical Synods, which alone can make Canons that shall be *Œcumenically* binding. This is the *authority*. It is as follows :—

II. *The Œcumenically approved authority of the Canons of the First Four Synods.*

1. These Synods, being the representatives of the Universal Church, made them. No authority, less than a representation of the Universal Church, can unmake them. For nothing less than an Œcumenical Synod, has authority to abolish what has been *Œcumenically* decreed. No Provincial Synod, no local Synod, like Trent, for instance, can abrogate the authority of the whole Church, East and West ; that Catholic or Universal Church, which we confess in the Creed. Now, has any Œcumenical Synod abrogated a single Canon ? No ! not one. But, on the other hand, two Œcumenical Synods, since the Fourth, have approved the work of the first four. The Canons of the first four Œcumenical Synods are, therefore, still binding.

2. Let us go on regarding the Œcumenical authority for the Œcumenical Canons. The Œcumenical Synod of Nicæa, in their Synodal Epistle, speaking of what had “been decreed” by them, which expression naturally signified their Canons and everything else, say that they believe them to have “been done” “according to the good pleasure of God the Father, in the Holy Ghost.”* These are the exact words.

3. And in their Second Canon, they condemn infractions of what they expressly term “the Canons of the Church ;” and

* See their Synodal Epistle in Hammond's Canons of the Church. The above translation is from it.

add, that "whosoever" shall act contrary to their enactments in that Second Canon, "will endanger his own orders, as boldly opposing the great Synod."

4. The Œcumenical Synod of Chalcedon, in its first Canon, decrees thus :

"We have thought it right that the Canons which have been issued by the holy Fathers in each Synod up to the present time, should continue in force,"*

The Greek Canonists, Zonarus and Balzamon, inform us, what is clear, that this is a confirmation of the Œcumenical and local Synods before Chalcedon. There had been three Œcumenical and five local Synods. The Œcumenical were Nicæa, and Constantinople and Ephesus, which with Chalcedon, here speaking, make up the first Four Œcumenical Synods. The local Synods were Ancyra, Neo-Cæsarea, Gangra, Antioch and Laodicea.

5. The Canons were held to be even above imperial laws. For, in the Fourth Act of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod, it is written :

"The most glorious archons said: 'It has seemed good to the most imperial Lord of the world,' [that is, the Emperor Marcian] 'that the affairs of the most holy Bishops should be transacted, not by imperial letters and pragmatic sanctions, but in accordance with the Canons enacted as laws by the Holy Fathers.' The Synod said: 'No imperial edict shall have force against the Canons! Let the Canons of the Fathers prevail!'"

And again :

"We pray that all the imperial edicts issued in regard to any thing in any province, to the injury of the Canons, shall, without any contradiction, be null and void; and that the Canons shall prevail in every thing. * * * We all say the same, all the imperial edicts shall be null and void! Let the Canons prevail! * * * In accordance with the vote of the Holy Synod, let the Canons prevail in all the other provinces."†

6. The Sixth Œcumenical Synod in its Definition says that

* See the *Πράξεις* of the Greeks, Athens edition of 1841, p. 104. The English translation above is from Hammond's *Canons of the Church*.

† See the *Πράξεις* of the Greeks, Athens edition of 1841, p. 13.

"Following closely the straight path of the Holy and approved Fathers," it "has piously given its *full* assent to the five holy and Œcumenical Synods, * * * renewing in *all things* the ancient Decrees of religion."*

And this strong language includes all the Canons, which in their time were all in force. This will suffice to show how clear it is, that the Universal Church has intended that all her Canons, to use her own words, "should continue in force," and how utterly baseless is the notion, so common among our more ignorant Clergy and people in these modern days, and among the more ignorant Latins, that the laws of all Christendom can be set aside and violated at the mere whim of a local Church, or even of an individual.

But let us glance at the witness of the East and West to that authority. At the start it is only just to state, that the *testimonies* are so numerous in local Synods and in Fathers, that our limits will admit of quoting but a few out of many. Begging our readers, therefore, to remember this fact, we proceed.

We notice first, *the reception of the Canons of the First Four Œcumenical Synods in the East, and their ancient and present authority there.* This is head III. The following are the important facts on this point :

A. 1. The Six Œcumenical Synods were attended almost solely by Eastern Prelates. Only a few Bishops were present in them from the West, as the place-holders of the Roman Patriarch. The language of the Acts is Greek ; and if any other was spoken by any Prelate, it needed to be first translated into the tongue of Hellas in order to be understood by the Council.† The Canons themselves were enacted in Greek. When the Bishops departed, they carried with them respect for the laws which they themselves had passed, and have maintained that respect until this day.

2. The Trullan, that is, Quinisext Synod, in its second Canon, approved all that the Council of Chalcedon had approved, and Chalcedon itself, and others of which we do not here speak.

* Hammond's Canons of the Church. Third Council of Constantinople.

† See the Acts of Chalcedon, in the parts where the place-holders of Leo I. of Rome speak.

3. The first Canon of the Image-worshipping Council of Nicæa, A. D. 783, termed by the Greeks and Latins the Seventh Œcumenical, approved all the Canons of the first Four Œcumenical Synods, and, those of all the local Synods just specified as approved by Chalcedon. Besides these, it approved others, with which, as not being the utterances of the Universal Church in its period of Orthodoxy, we have here no concern. These Canons approving the Canons of the first four Œcumenical Councils, and those of the local Councils approved by Chalcedon, are still Law in the Eastern Church. So that the salient fact regarding the Eastern Church is, that this communion, which embraces in its pale every Church mentioned in the New Testament, with the solitary exception of Rome, still regards the Canons of the first four Œcumenical Synods and of the local Synods approved by Chalcedon, the last of those four Synods, as living law, which is obligatory upon all Christians. This is their testimony, strong and full and clear.

Of course it is not said that there has never been such a thing in the East as the State sometimes disregarding the Canons. But we know of no wilful disobedience to them, where the Eastern Church is free to act, as, for instance, in the Patriarchates.

We now, B., give quotations from the Greek Fathers, on the Canons. We have space to cite only a few out of many. They shall be : 1. BASIL THE GREAT, BISHOP OF CÆSAREA IN CAPPADOCIA, in the fourth century. 2. JOHN, made Patriarch of Constantinople, in century IV., and surnamed, from his eloquence, CHRYSOSTOM, or the Golden-mouthed. 3. THE BISHOPS who favored St. John Chrysostom against Theophilus of Alexandria. 4. EUTYCHIUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, in the sixth century, and 5. SOPHRONIUS, PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM, in the seventh century.*

* A long passage from Athanasius, the greatest Bishop that the Church of God ever produced, we are compelled to omit, owing to its length, and passages from other Easterns with it. It is his Encyclical Epistle to all the Bishops of the Universal Church. It is in "The Historical Tracts of S. Athanasius," Oxford Translation, A.D. 1843. See the Greek in Migne's *Cursus Completus*, Greeks, tom. 25, Col. 224. It has reference to Canons before Nicæa even. But the principles of law, for which he contends, exist in the Œcumenical Canons.

1. BASIL THE GREAT, referring to the negligence in which the Canons concerning the choosing of fit men for the ministry had fallen, writes :

“ It very much grieves me that the Canons of the Fathers, moreover, are laid aside, and that all strictness has been driven away from the Churches ; and I fear, lest, little by little, by the increasing prevalence of this indifference, the affairs of the Church may come into perfect confusion.”*

2. ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, who became Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 398. This greatest of Christian orators during the primitive period of the Church, has left on record his reverence for the enactments of the Universal Church of God. For, reasoning against one who refused to keep Easter at the time specified in the law of the Œcumenical Synod of Nicæa, he writes thus :

“ Hast thou not heard Christ Himself saying, *where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them?* But if, where there are *two or three*, Christ is *in the midst*, where three hundred and many more were present, He was present much rather than where there are two or three, and HE DECIDED EVERYTHING AND ENACTED THE LAWS.”†

These laws of Nicæa, it must be remembered, are nearly all of them in its Canons. So that the salient fact from this testimony of St. John Chrysostom is that he believed Christ to have made the Canons of the Œcumenical Synod of Nicæa, and the reason which he gives applies to all the Œcumenical Canons, all of which were enacted by more than two or three, and most of them enacted or received into the Œcumenical code by the Council of Chalcedon, which numbered 630 Bishops, almost twice the number assembled at Nicæa. This testimony of a Father of the Primitive Church deserves to be held in eternal memory.

3. An attempt to violate a Canon of Nicæa¹ was made, A. D. 403, by Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria and other Prelates

* Basil Magn. Epist. Class. 11, Epist. 55, in Migne's Greeks, tom. 32, Col. 400. The Epistle is addressed to Chorepiscopi.

† Joan. Chrysost. in eos qui Pascha jejulant adversus Jud. Orat. III., Col. 865 in tom. 43 of Migne's Greeks.

with him. Out of unworthy motives Theophilus and others conspired against John Chrysostom. Contrary to Canon VI. of Nicæa, Theophilus went out of the limits of his own jurisdiction to a place called the Oak, a suburb of Chalcedon near Constantinople, gathered a Synod there, and summoned Chrysostom to appear before him, and answer certain trumped up and unjust charges. When Chrysostom and his Bishops received the citation, they pointed out to Theophilus the violence he was doing to the Canons of Nicæa, and begged him to desist, and obey these Canons. "Do not," cried they, "overturn the affairs of the Church, and do not rend the Church." And then they tell him that he is "disorderly" if he "overturns the Canons of the 318 Bishops in Nicæa," and judges "a case out of his own limits." And when, notwithstanding this protest, violence was done to the Canons of Nicæa by the aid of the secular power, and John Chrysostom was deposed, the general indignation was excited at the uncanonicity of the act; the East and West lifted up their cry of disapprobation, and the outraged Canon and the exiled Bishop were vindicated for all time.*

4. EUTYCHIUS is given elsewhere.

5. SOPHRONIUS, PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM, in century VII., before the sixth Synod was held, writes thus of the Œcumenical Synods :

"Those four sacred and great and Œcumenical holy Synods, I salute and embrace with one mind, and, in addition to them, I glorify, honor and venerate this Fifth Synod also. And I gladly accept everything of theirs in dogmas and in different instructions, and in anathemas against the favorers of heresies, and in decrees."†

6. In the eighth century, and thereafter, a late and corrupt period, both the Iconoclastic and the Iconodulic parties, how-

* See the account of the Concilium ad Quercum in Baluz. Nova Collect. Concil. Col. 108.

† Sophronii Patriarch. Hierosol. Epist. Synodica ad Sergium C. P. in Migne's *Greeks*, 5, 87, 3. See GERMANUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, *De Hæresibus et Synodis*, in Migne's *Greeks*, tom. 98, Col. 84. For more language in favor of the Canons see tom. 99 of Migne's *Greeks* under "Canonum," "Canones" and "Canon," in the Index. The language is that of THEODORUS STUDITA. See also *id.*, t. 100, under "Canon," "Canonum," in the Index for the words of NICEPHORUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE. And see the Indexes to the works of PHOTIUS and the other *Greeks*, published by Migne, under proper words.

ever divided as to the duty of worshipping images (pictured, not graven) were agreed in receiving six Synods. At this modern day the Easterns are strict in the observance of all that they regard as Œcumenical.*

We notice next, and IV., THE FORMER AUTHORITY OF THE ŒCUMENICAL CANONS IN THE WEST. We cite first quotations from the Latin Fathers. Of these, we select quotations, 1. from Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in North Africa, of centuries IV. and V. 2. From Leo I. and Great, Patriarch of Rome in century V. 3. From Vigilius, Patriarch of Rome in century VI. And 4, from Gregory I. and Great, Patriarch of Rome in centuries VI. and VII. 5. From Hincmar, the learned and distinguished Metropolitan of Rheims, who, in the ninth century, made one of the last stands for the Œcumenical Canons before they were undermined and wrecked in the Occident by the False Decretals, and the innovations of the Roman Patriarchs and Councils of the West, or parts of it.

1. ST. AUGUSTINE, BISHOP OF HIPPO, had marked respect for the Canons of Nicæa. He had been ordained as successor to Valerius in the Episcopate of Hippo, while that Prelate was still living. This was contrary to Canon VIII. of Nicæa. But both Valerius and Augustine were ignorant of this law. But when Augustine learned of the Canon, he revered and obeyed it. For when he became old, and wished Eraclius, a presbyter, to be chosen by the people as his successor before his death, but not to be ordained Bishop until after his death, he insisted that the Canon should not be violated. On that occasion we read, he assembled the Clergy and the people of his *Parœcia*, that is, Diocese, in the Church of Peace. Augustine, the Bishop, said :

"I know what you also know, but I am unwilling that that should be done regarding him" [that is, Eraclius, whom he had just proposed to the people as his successor] "which was done regarding me. But many of you know what was done : The only ones who do not know are those, who, at that time, were either not yet born, or who had not yet come to the age of knowledge. While my Father and Bishop, the aged Valerius of blessed memory, was yet living, I was ordained Bishop, and I sat with him. I did not know that this had been pro-

* See, in proof, the *Προάγιον* passim, and especially the preliminary matter.

hibited by the Nicæan Council, nor did he. What therefore has been blamed in myself I am unwilling should be blamed in my son." [That is, the presbyter Eraclius, whom he had just nominated as his successor.] "*The people shouted, 'Thanks to God! Praises to Christ!'* This was said thirteen times. When silence was restored, *Augustine the Bishop said: He will be a presbyter as he is; when God wills, he will be Bishop.*"*

And so did Augustine and his Clergy and people see to it, that Canon VIII. of Nicæa, which forbids two Bishops to be in the same city, should be reverently obeyed. Moreover he informs us, that the uncanonicity of his Ordination had been blamed. This shows how the Canons of Nicæa were regarded in that early age, before, by Synodal enactment, any part of the Universal Church had committed itself to the worship of creatures. And another thing in this conduct of Augustine deserves honorable mention. He did not sin against a Canon of God's Universal Church with his eyes open. That would have been unworthy of Augustine or of any true and conscientious presbyter. But he himself states that both Valerius and himself were ignorant of this Canon.

Yet another thing is still more honorable. He did not defend his unintentional disobedience to the laws of God's holy Church. 'Because he had done wrong he did not try to break down the Canons and say, as do many unlearned Bishops and Clergy in our day, Oh, the Canons are not binding. A man may obey the laws of God's Universal Church or not, as he pleases. We are in the wrong, according to the Canons, and we will not amend that wrong. No! Augustine knew that Christ had said, "Hear the Church,"† and if it be obligatory on a man to hear the local Church, much more the whole Church. He knew that the Church is by the utterance of the Holy Ghost, "the pillar and ground of the truth,"‡ and that much of the truth which it teaches, is in the Canons. He knew that Christ had said even to the Seventy at the start: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me."|| And if this was true of the Seventy, much

* Augustin. Epist. 213, Classis III., in Migne's Latins, tom. 33, Col. 967.

† Matt. xviii. 17, 18.

‡ I. Tim. iii. 15.

|| Luke x. 16.

more of the Apostles and their successors assembled in Ecumenical Synod. He knew that Christ had given to the Apostles the power of discipline in the authority to bind and to loose,* and through them to their successors. In governing the Church, as in everything else, he had promised to be with the Apostolate, alway, even unto the end of the world.† The Apostles had exercised that power again and again: St. Paul, in excommunicating the incestuous person at Corinth,‡ and Hymenaeus and Alexander,|| and even in such trivial matters as we might at first sight deem them, as covering or uncovering the head,§ (or rather, as it is in the Greek, veiling or unveiling the head), and he knew that other Apostles had used this power of discipline in other ways: He knew that the power of binding and loosing in doctrine and discipline, had been given, not to laymen, nor to presbyters, but to the Apostolate, and its Episcopal Succession alone. And he knew that this assembled Episcopate had taught him in the Canons of Nicaea, and he feared to despise those to whom God had committed the power of discipline. He recognized the fact that they enacted Canons by the power of binding and loosing, and, therefore, by *Divine*, and not by *mere human authority*. And he revered God, speaking in those whom He had sent, and to whom alone He had given authority to rule the Church of God. And law-making he knew is a part of ruling. His past irregularity he could not recall. But, as a God-fearing and reverent man, he would not palliate nor defend a wrong, nor do anything which might tend to conceal the fact regarding it. But he assembles his clergy and people in the Church of Peace at Hippo, confesses his unintentional sin before them all, and guards against a like fault in the case of his successor, and he could do no more. And the Orthodox people thank God and praise Christ for the grace which had inspired this action of their beloved and venerable Bishop, the Great Augustine.

Would God that Bishops and Clergy and people were now

* Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18.

† Matt. xxviii. 20

‡ I. Cor. v. 1—5. Compare II. Cor. ii. 5—12.

|| I. Tim. i. 20.

§ I. Cor. xi. 2—17.

inspired with the same reverence for the Canons of God's Holy Church which marked Augustine, his Clergy, and people. But alas ! alas ! the night of western mediæval decadence and modern ignorance, so prevalent in the Occident regarding the authority of the Œcumenical Canons, has fallen like a funeral pall over all our discipline. God's Universal Church, in the popular estimation, is nowhere. Its authority is a sham and a humbug. And this too, though we confess the authority of the Canons every time we profess, in the symbol or Creed of that Universal Church, to believe in the authority of the "one Holy Universal and Apostolic Church." The spirit of lawlessness cries, "Down with the power of binding and loosing. It is tyranny. It is clerical power. Away with the utterances of our Saviour and Master, Christ." "Let us not" say they, "look for Church discipline to the Bible, and to the voice of the Universal Church, which Christ has commanded us to hear, but let us rather prefer the voice of the people, and appeal to them to bear us out in our arrogance and self-will."

2. Prominent among the greatest men of the Western Church, when it still maintained its connection with the Apostolic sees of the East, is Leo I. Patriarch of Rome, A. D. 440-461. With Ambrose, Augustine and Pope Gregory I., he makes up the four Great Doctors of the Occident, and of Latin Christendom. Situated at the head of the greatest See of Christendom, and actually ruling a large part, or perhaps the whole of the Occident, (for a decree of the emperor Valentinian III. gives him this power,) his witness as to the authority of Œcumenical Canons is peculiarly important. In his quarrel with Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople, he speaks mainly with reference to the Œcumenical Synod of Nicæa. A few quotations from him will show his temper and spirit.

(a.) Writing, A. D. 446, to Anastasius, Bishop of Thessalonica, at that time his Suffragan and Vicar, as it would seem, and referring to Canon IV. of Nicæa, which guarantees to Metropolitans their rights, he says :

"Therefore, in accordance with the Canons of the holy Fathers, WHICH HAVE BEEN COMPOSED BY THE SPIRIT OF GOD, AND CONSECRATED BY THE REVERENCE OF THE WHOLE WORLD, we decide that

the Metropolitan Bishops of each province, over whom by power delegated from us, thy Brotherliness' care extends, shall have inviolate the legal dignity anciently given them, so that in this way they may not, by any negligence or presumption, depart from the rules before established."*

(b.) And, writing to the Emperor Marcian in regard to what he deemed the offensive ambition of Anatolius of Constantinople, and his treatment of Antioch, contrary, as Leo I. thought, to Canon VI. of Nicæa, he tells the Orthodox Emperor regarding Anatolius :

"Although for some of his excellent actions, and his very fine judgment, he had been lawfully and in accordance with usage ordained, nevertheless he ought not to be assisted, against the Canons of the Fathers, against THE ENACTMENTS OF THE HOLY GHOST, against the examples of antiquity. * * For the privileges of the Holy Churches, which were fixed by THE CANONS OF THE FATHERS, AND BY THE DECREES OF THE VENERABLE SYNOD OF NICÆA, CAN BE RENT AWAY FROM THEM BY NO SHAMELESS IMPUDENCE; NOR, MOREOVER, CAN THEY BE CHANGED BY ANY INNOVATION. In faithfully following out this business, it is necessarily incumbent on me, by Christ's aid, to exhibit zeal. And this, because a Diocese" [or "a dispensation"] "has been committed to me, and it would tend towards accusing me, if by my conspiring with another, (which God forbid,) THE CANONS OF THE FATHERS' DECREES, WHICH, BY THE TEACHING OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD, WERE ENACTED IN THE SYNOD OF NICÆA, FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE WHOLE CHURCH, should be shaken; and, in that case, the will of one brother would have a greater influence with me, than the common advantage of the whole house of the Lord.

"And therefore, knowing that thy glorious Serenity is zealous for the agreement of the Church, and that it offers a pious consent to what is adapted to promote a pacific unity, I beg and exhort, with most earnest entreaty, that thy Piety publicly renounce all approbation of the shameless attempts, which are opposed to unity and to the peace of Christians, and that, for the common safety, thou wouldest check the wish of my brother, Anatolius, which will be injurious to himself, if he persists in it; . . . and let the aforesaid Bishop obey the Fathers, let him consult for peace, and let him not think that he can do everything. For he has dared, without any precedent for it, and contrary to the *Canons*, to ordain a Bishop for the Church of the Antiochians, which thing we, from a desire to strengthen the faith, and from zeal for peace, have not ceased to *trace out and expose*. Let him therefore cease to do wrong to the Ecclesiastical Canons, and let him depart from his *illegal* transgressions, lest, while he attempts what is hostile to peace, he may cut himself off from the Universal Church. We pray, rather, that he may act blamelessly, so that we

* Leon. Magn. Epis. xiv., cap. 2; edit. Frat. Ballerin.

may love him, rather than that he should persist in this rashness, which may separate him from all."*

(c.) Writing to the Empress, Pulcheria, and still complaining of Anatolius, and of the twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, which he mistakenly supposed to be contrary to the sixth Canon of Nicæa, Leo I. states:—

"It is conceded to no man, to venture anything against the Canons of the Fathers, which, very many years ago, were settled by spiritual decrees, in the city of Nicæa, so that, if any one wishes to decree *anything* different from them, he lessens himself, rather than destroys them. But if, as it behooves, they are observed *inviolatè* BY ALL BISHOPS, there will be tranquil peace and firm concord through all the Churches: there will be no dissensions about the amount of honors, no disputes about ordinations, no ambiguities about privileges, no contests regarding usurping another's rights, but, by the even law of love, the reasonable order of customs and of offices, will be preserved."†

(d.) Below, in this same Epistle, Leo I. informs us, that "the Provinces were regulated by the sway of the holy Nicæan Synod of former times."‡

(e.) And still further on, in this same Epistle, he writes:—

"IN ALL ECCLESIASTICAL CASES, WE SUBMIT TO THOSE LAWS WHICH THE HOLY GHOST ENACTED THROUGH THE 318 HOLY BISHOPS, TO BE OBSERVED BY ALL PRIESTS. So that, even if many more Bishops" [the reference to the 630 Bishops of Chalcedon] "should decree anything other than what they enacted, IT SHOULD BE HELD IN NO REVERENCE, IF IT BE DIFFERENT FROM A CONSTITUTION OF THE AFORESAID FATHERS."§

* Leon. Magn. Epist. civ., (ad Marcianum Augustum,) edit. Ballerin. We have translated from the Greek.

† Leon. Magn. Epist. cv., (ad Pulcheriam Augustam, de ambitu Anatoliæ) edit. Ballerin.

‡ Leon. Magn. Epist. cv.: *Quietisque provinciis, et olim Sanctæ Synodi Nicænæ moderatione dispositis, etc.*

§ Leon. Magn. Epist. cv., (ad Pulcheriam Augustam,) edit. Ballerin. Leo's opposition to Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, was never regarded by the Universal Church. For the fifth and sixth Œcumenical Synods approved Chalcedon absolutely; and it is well known, that the mere local opinion of Leo has never been regarded by the four Eastern Patriarchates. For, to this day, Constantinople ranks before Alexandria and Antioch, and Rome has, long since, recognized this arrangement. Still, the East has been rigorous for the Canons of Nicæa. On this point there was no difference between Leo I. and Chalcedon. They differed only regarding Canon III. of I. Constantinople, and the Œcumenicity of that Synod, and Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon. But the Universal Church, in the fifth and sixth Œcumenical Synods, has affirmed both Synods against him, without excepting a single one of their enactments.

(f.) In Epistle cvi., written to Anatolius of Constantinople, Leo I. has much to say regarding the Canons of Nicæa. Anatolius had ordained Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, contrary to Canon VI. of Nicæa, which guards the rights of Antioch, and of Metropolitans. Leo I. opposes this infraction of that Canon, and contends against it in this letter. He terms the Canons of the first Synod, "the most sacred constitutions of the Nicæan Canons," and accuses Anatolius of having attempted to infringe them.*

(g.) Further on, he accuses him of procuring the passage of Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, contrary, as Leo wrongly supposed, to Canon VI. of Nicæa: "As if" writes Leo, "what a multitude unlawfully willed," [the allusion is to the 630 Bishops, who constituted the Œcumenical Synod of Chalcedon,] "might not be repealed, and as if that condition of things, which was ordained by the Nicæan Canons BY THE AID OF THE TRULY HOLY GHOST, COULD BE ABROGATED, IN ANY OF ITS PARTS, BY ANY person."†

(h.) Below he says:—

"The Nicæan Synod was sanctified with so great privileges by God, that Ecclesiastical judgments, whether celebrated by a smaller or greater number, are WHOLLY VOID OF AUTHORITY, WHERE THEY DIFFER FROM ITS ENACTMENT.‡"

(i.) In this Epistle, Leo has much on the respect due to the Canons of Nicæa, but we have room only for a few more extracts. One is as follows:—

"Those holy and venerable Fathers, who, in the city of the Nicæans, condemned the specific impiety of the sacrilegious Arius, enacted laws in the form of Ecclesiastical Canons, TO ENDURE TO THE END OF THE WORLD, [or "FOREVER"] "and, BY THEIR ENACTMENTS, THEY LIVE AMONG US, AND IN ALL THE WORLD. And if, at any time, an attempt should presumptuously be made to enact anything otherwise than as they enacted, WITHOUT DOUBT IT WOULD BE NULL AND VOID, and this, in order that what was enacted, by the general consent, for perpetual advantage, should be transgressed by NO CHANGE; and that no one should wrest, to his own private claim, what was enacted for the common advantage; and the landmarks, which the Fathers have set, still re

* Leon. Magn. Epist. cvi., (ad Anatolium) edit. Ballerin. See note below.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Leon. Magn. Epist. cvi., (ad Anatolium) edit. Ballerin.

maintaining, let no one assault another's right, but let each, within his own and *legal* limits, and as he can, exercise himself in the breadth of love."*

(k.) Still another extract. Pope Leo I., in his 119th Epistle 'to Maximus, Bishop of Antioch,' writes :—

"So great reverence have I for the Nicæan Canons, that I could not permit, nor will I suffer, what has been established by the holy Fathers, to be violated by *any novelty*."

"But now, let it suffice to pronounce, generally, in reference to all things, that if, contrary to the statutes of the Nicæan Canons, anything has been attempted, by any one, in any Synod whatsoever, or if anything seems to have been extorted, for a time, it can work no prejudice to its INVIOABLE decrees : and the compacts which are the results of any agreements, whatsoever agreements they be, may be dissolved more easily than the rules of the aforesaid Canons can be corrupted, in any of their parts. . . .

"This is my definition, namely, that however large may be the number of Priests who may decree anything which amounts to a theft from any others, if their decree be found adverse to those constitutions of the 318 Fathers, it may be ANNULLED, from considerations of justice : since THE TRANQUILLITY OF THE UNIVERSAL PEACE can be kept in no other way, THAN BY PRESERVING INVIOABLE THEIR OWN DUE REVERENCE FOR THE CANONS."

Again and again, in other places, does Leo I. express his intention not to swerve from the Canons of Nicæa, but what we have quoted must suffice.

* Leon. Magn. Epist. cvi., (*ad Anatolium Episcopum Constantinopol.*) edit Ballerin.

* Leon. Magn. Epist. cxix., edit. Ballerin. : '*ad Maximum Antiochenum Episcopum.*'

(To be continued.)

ART. VI.—THE YALE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY ON
THE EPISCOPATE.

The Rise of the Episcopate as a Distinct Office in the Church.

By GEORGE S. MERRIAM, M. A., Yale Theological Seminary:
"New Englander," July, 1867.

THE Yale Theological Seminary has been, for the last twenty years, almost a nominal Institution, without real life. Though boasting a few able and talented Professors, its classes have been very small, and it has attracted but little notice, even in the Congregational world. But of late it has shared in the pecuniary prosperity of the College. New Professorships, (including a Chair of Ecclesiastical History—a superfluity, one would imagine, in a Congregational institution,) have been founded, and a determined effort made to give new life and energy to a school, honored by the names of Taylor and Goodrich. With this end in view, a general re-union of the Alumni, in the month of May, was proposed, and Circulars sent out to all the graduates, including some who are now ministering in the Church of Seabury and Hobart. The exercises of the day were quite interesting, even to those who reject the views of Ecclesiastical Discipline taught in the Seminary, and general good feeling prevailed. Of course, on such an important occasion, it was highly desirable that Prelacy, and the "monstrous Regiment" of Bishops, should receive a death-blow; and, accordingly, the ablest of the youthful speakers demolished the monster, at least to his own satisfaction, and that of most of the audience assembled in the "College street Congregational Church."

Here we might let the matter rest, confident that Episcopacy will receive its annual quietus, at the hands of one or more of the student speakers, at each anniversary of the Yale Seminary, as long as that Institution continues to flourish. But, Mr. Merriam's Essay has been published in the *New Englander*, and now seems to challenge the attention and admiration of

the Christian World—or at least of New England, which is about the same thing, to a descendant of Cotton Mather. We will, therefore, humbly presume to examine this Essay, and its theory concerning the “Rise of the Episcopate as a Distinct Office in the Church.”

Now, it is a noticeable fact, that this Essay, by a *Congregationalist* divinity student, is, throughout, an argument for *Presbyterianism*, against Episcopacy. The writer constantly speaks of the first Presbyters, or Elders, as set apart and ordained by the Apostles, and not by the “Churches.” In former days, when the students enjoyed the benefit of Professor Goodrich’s lectures, a very different theory prevailed in the Seminary. They were taught, by their venerated preceptor, that no distinct Form of Church Government was laid down in the New Testament, but that Congregationalism was the nearest to the Apostolic model. It was further defined to be of the essence of Congregationalism, that the Laity had the power, not only to elect, but also to *ordain*, their own Pastors; though they might, from courtesy, delegate to neighboring Pastors, their right of Ordination, “which,” (said Prof. G.,) “is only a solemn *induction* into office.”

Not a word of all this in the Essay. Was the talented young author confused in his ideas of Church Polity? Or has a new “Development of Doctrine” taken place in the Yale Theological Seminary? The author, after stating, very fairly, the two theories of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, (giving “the cold shoulder” entirely to Congregationalism,) calls attention to the interchangeable use of the terms *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* in the New Testament. Nobody disputes that the terms are so used. Not only the words *episcopos* and *presbuteros*, are used interchangeably, but so are the words *apostolos* and *diaconos*: for St. Paul declared that himself and Apollos were Deacons. (1 Cor. iii. 5.) But does this prove, that there was no such thing as an Order of Apostles, or an Order of Deacons, in the New Testament Church? It certainly does prove it, if Mr. Merriam’s argument is good for anything. The truth is, that all these words, and others, were used, at first, not in their technical meaning. They acquired

that meaning subsequently. When Mr. Merriam shall have learned, that *what the Apostles did in establishing the Church and the Faith, under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghost promised for that end, has divine authority*, he will have learned a great truth. Matt. xxviii. 20 ; Acts, i. 2-8. If it be asked, why there is not a "Thus saith the Lord," a positive command, on which to rest the Institutions, the Faith, and even the sacred Books of Christianity ? we can only answer, we do not know all the reasons. We suppose one reason was, that there might be temptation to write just such Essays as this by Mr. Merriam.

The author now proceeds to what he regards as his main question, as follows :—

"The question is, did they appoint successors to themselves in this authority, who were to appoint their successors, and so render the office a permanent one—or was this authority peculiar to themselves, personally, as the founders of the Church, and was their office thus to terminate with their own lives ?"

Before discussing the question, we will notice Mr. Merriam's foot-note, in which he asks, "If the Apostles *did* appoint Bishops, why does it follow that they intended this office to be perpetual ?" We will reply, in the New England style, by asking another question : If the Apostles did appoint the observance of the First Day of the week, instead of the Seventh, why does it follow that they intended it to be perpetual ? It is not expressly *commanded* in the New Testament ; the references to it are very few—in fact, the amount of evidence for the observance of the Lord's Day, in Holy Scripture and the earliest Fathers of the Church, is by no means equal to that which proves the Apostolic Succession in the Episcopate. And yet the change of day has been a universal tradition of the Christian Church. We doubt not, for an instant, that Mr. Merriam, as a young man of "hopeful piety," always "keeps the Sabbath" on the first day of the week, in the most orthodox Puritan manner. Why does he follow the Apostolic Tradition in one case, and not in another ? Why does he not fling overboard the Lord's Day and Infant Baptism, to keep company with Prelacy and Confirmation ? The Seventh Day

Baptists are the most consistent Dissenters from Church Doctrine.

But to return to the main question. While we have no doubt that Mr. Merriam intended to be candid, we have noticed, with the utmost pain, that he cites at large the authorities which seem to make for his side, and slurs over those which are opposed to him. This was, doubtless, an oversight on his part, and is, therefore, pardonable. During the lifetime of "the Twelve," it is manifest that we have no Presbyterian organization in the Church. The Apostles appear everywhere as supreme in the Church, setting apart, first, an Order of Deacons, (Acts vi.,) and then an Order of Presbyters, or Elders, who are first mentioned in Acts, xi. 30. We look in vain for Presbyterian Assemblies and Synods, on the one hand, or Congregational Churches and Associations, on the other. Everything is done by the sole authority of the Apostles, except when a General Council is summoned at Jerusalem, and a Decree put forth in the name of "the Apostles, Elders, and brethren."

Nor is the Apostolic Office limited to "the Twelve." We find the word *ἀπόστολος* affixed, in the New Testament, to Matthias, Paul, Barnabas, Andronicus, Junias, James the Lord's brother, Timothy, Titus, Silas and Luke. But Mr. Merriam seems to think, that there is a distinction in *order* between "travelling" or Missionary Bishops, and "local" or Diocesan Bishops. St. Timothy, called the first Bishop of Ephesus, was, in his judgment, merely "an Evangelist,—i. e., a travelling-preacher"—though we fail to see how he gets the idea of "travelling," out of the word Evangelist. If this be so, it is high time that Bishops Randall and Tuttle should come back to the East for Episcopal Consecration, since Mr. Merriam has decided that their Office is essentially different from the Episcopacy held by the Bishops of Connecticut and Minnesota. It is true, he concedes in a foot-note, that "James resided long at Jerusalem, and was head of the Church in that place."

The foot-note undoes the work of the text. It is, of itself, sufficient to disprove his alleged fact, that "the Second Century idea" of a Bishop, is not to be found in the New Testa-

ment. St. Ignatius, writing about A. D. 115, according to our author, (though we would assign a somewhat earlier date to that author) is conceded, by Mr. Merriam, as an advocate of Diocesan Episcopacy; and he is gracious enough to admit, that this innovation had, at that date, taken root in Asia Minor, where St. John had been living a few years previous. For the space, then, of nine or ten years, between the death of St. John at Ephesus, and the Epistles of Ignatius, pure Presbyterianism prevailed in the world. Oh! that some modest student of the Yale Seminary had been living at that blissful epoch of the Church's history, to raise his warning voice against a change and downfall into the horrors of Diocesan Episcopacy, so distinctly portrayed in the pages of St. Ignatius! But, alas! this boon was denied the world, and no hand has recorded the name of that audacious "*Primus inter pares*," who, without a protest on the part of his brother Presbyters, dared to proclaim himself a successor of the Apostles in their holy Office. Certainly, Mr. Merriam would not have been so forbearing. He is slightly unjust in his treatment of St. Clement, who, beyond all reasonable doubt, was a Diocesan Bishop of Rome. He cites freely from St. Clement's Epistle with reference to Presbyters, but omits all allusion to the only passage where the Three Orders in the Christian Ministry are clearly and unmistakably pointed out. We will quote the passage, which can be found in chapter xl. :—

"God hath Himself ordained, by His supreme will, both where and by what persons WE should perform our service and offerings unto Him. They, therefore, who make their oblations at the appointed seasons, are accepted and happy; for they sin not, inasmuch as they obey the commandments of the Lord. For to the CHIEF PRIEST [Bishop,] his peculiar Offices are given; and to the PRIESTS [Presbyters,] their own place is appointed; and to the LEVITES [Deacons,] appertain their proper ministries; and the LAYMAN is confined within the bounds of what is commanded to Laymen."

There is no reference whatever, in this Chapter, to the Jewish Church, nor were the Jewish people ever called *Laymen*. St. Clement is speaking, beyond all question, of the Christian Church in his own day, and he uses figurative language, common enough to the Early Fathers, as to Churchmen of the

present day ; but which would be without meaning, if applied to a Presbyterian organization. Tertullian (De Bapt.) speaks of the High Priest, who is the Bishop. And St. Jerome, (Mr. Merriam's famous "Presbyterian,") tells us, (*Ep. Evang.*,) that Christian Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, succeed to the Jewish High Priests, Priests and Levites.

There is another passage, in the same Epistle of St. Clement, in which we find, though less clearly indicated, an allusion to the diverse Orders in the Christian ministry. He compares the Church to a royal army, and says :—

"All are not chiliarchs, nor prefects, nor centurions, nor inferior officers : but every one *in his respective rank*, does what is commanded him by the king, and by those who have the authority over him."

In the light of these passages, we are prepared to understand the sentences, which are so puzzling to the Yale Divinity student. We give it in his own translation from chapter xlv :

"Our Apostles also knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be *strife* about the Bishop's office. For this reason, then, having received full foreknowledge, they appointed *those whom I have mentioned* ; and afterward gave commandment that when these died, other approved men should receive their ministry."

And yet, in the teeth of all this, Mr. Merriam ventures to assert, that "*nowhere* in the Epistle is there any mention of such superior Order ;" i. e., superior to Presbyters. We do not doubt the honesty of the assertion for an instant ; but it betrays a lack of investigation. He has relied on second-hand authorities.

He fails to find any witness for Episcopacy (except Ignatius,) prior to the time of St. Irenæus. Perhaps an old "Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians," has, by accident, been torn out of his copy of the Apostolic Fathers. The Epistle opens with the words, "POLYCARP, and the Presbyters who are with him, to the Church of God at Philippi ; mercy, etc." And why, we ask at the outset, Polycarp ? Can Mr. Merriam explain why this distinguished Clergyman assumes the style of an Apostle ? Would it not be more in accordance with Congregational or Presbyterian usage, if we were to read : 'The

First Church of Christ at Smyrna, through their pastor or stated supply, Polycarp, to the Central Presbyterian Church at Philippi, greeting,' etc. ? We would respectfully suggest this amendment of the text in later editions of the *Fathers*. If we read on a little farther, we shall come to the words, "These things, brethren, I write you concerning justice, not that I would arrogate power, but because yourselves have invoked *my* aid." In another part of the *Epistle*, he speaks of visiting them in person, or sending a Legate in his stead. The style is altogether inappropriate for a simple Presbyter; it could only fitly be used by one, who claimed to have succeeded the Apostles in their office and authority. From its whole tenor, the candid reader can hardly resist the conclusion, that there was a vacancy in the See of Philippi, and that Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, was, at the request of that Church, exercising jurisdiction. St. Ignatius, in his *Epistle* to Polycarp, requests him to take the oversight of the Church at Antioch.

But we need not pursue the argument from the *Fathers* much beyond this, since our Essayist concedes that all, subsequent to St. Irenæus, (with the exception of St. Jerome,) were advocates of Episcopacy. He might have mentioned, in an impartial survey of his authorities, that Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, were as decided advocates of Episcopacy, as their co-temporary, St. Irenæus.

Perhaps we may as well here notice what Mr. Merriam says about the Angels of the Seven Churches in Asia. His language is,—

"The first chapters of Revelation are appealed to, on the ground that the seven angels of the seven Churches must represent the Bishops of those Churches. This interpretation seems unnatural, as giving an unaccountable prominence to seven individuals not otherwise known."

The following, from the Non-Episcopal Mosheim, in his *Commentaries*, may be thought by Mr. Merriam to have some weight."

"In the more considerable ones (Churches) at least, if not in the others, it came *even during the life-time of the Apostles, and with their approbation*, to be the practice for some one man, more eminent than

the rest, to be invested with the presidency, or chief direction. And, in support of this opinion, we are supplied with an argument of such strength, in those 'angels' to whom St. John addressed the Epistles, which, *by the command of our Saviour Himself*, he sent to the seven Churches of Asia, Rev. ii. iii., *as the Presbyterians, as they are termed, let them labor and strive what they may, will never be able to overcome.* It must be evident to every one, even on a cursory perusal of the Epistles to which we refer, that those who are therein termed 'angels,' were persons possessing such a degree of authority in their respective Churches, as enabled them to mark, with merited disgrace, whatever might appear to be deserving of reprehension, and also to give due countenance and encouragement to everything that was virtuous and commendable. But even supposing that we were to waive the advantage, that is to be derived from this argument in establishing the antiquity of the Episcopal character, it appears to me, that the bare consideration alone of the state of the Church in its infancy, must be sufficient to convince any rational, unprejudiced person, that the order of Bishops could not have originated at a period, considerably more recent than that which gave birth to Christianity itself." (Vol. 1, page 172.)

Again, he admits that "the Church of Jerusalem, at the time of that city's being taken and finally laid waste by the Emperor Hadrian, towards the middle of the second Century, (about the year of our Lord 137 or 138,) had had fourteen Bishops; without our reckoning James as one of them." (Vol. 1, p. 173.) "It will be equally placed beyond dispute, that the Church of Jerusalem had over it a Bishop, long enough before the close of the first Century after Christ." (Ib. p. 178.) Again, "That these Bishops were, on their creation, invested with *certain peculiar rights, and a degree of power which placed them much above the Presbyters*, will not be disputed by, any unprejudiced or impartial persons." (Ib. p. 174.)

We come now to what Mr. Merriam evidently regards as one of his strongest points. It is his use of the testimony of St. Jerome. He says:—

"Jerome, at the end of the fourth Century, the first scholar of his age, declares the original parity of the Clergy, and supports this view by the striking case of the Church in Alexandria, where, down to the middle of the third Century, the Presbyters continued to choose and install their own Bishops." In a note he says:*

The whole passage of St. Jerome is as follows:—

* Jerome's statement, as to the Alexandrian statement, is clear. "Nam et Alexandria a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, (240 A. D.) Presbyteri semper unum ex se selectum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant. Quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut diaconi eligant de se, quem inditrium noverint, et archidiaconum vocent." (Epist. ad Evangelum—146th in Benedictine ed.)

"For at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist, even to Heraclas and Dionysius the Bishops, the Presbyters always *nominated* as Bishop one, chosen from themselves, and placed in *higher degree*. As if an army should make an emperor, or the Deacons should choose one of themselves, whom they knew to be diligent, and call him Arch-deacon. For what doth a Bishop do, ORDINATION EXCEPTED, (ordinatione excepta,) which a Presbyter may not do? Nor is the Church of Rome to be considered *one*, and the Church of the world *another*. Gaul and Britain, and Africa and Persia, and the East, and India, and all the barbarous nations, worship one Christ, observe one rule of Faith. If authority is desired, the world is greater than a city. Wherever there is a *Bishop*, whether at Rome or Eugubium, Constantino-ple or Rhegium, *Alexandria* or Tanais, he is of the *same validity*. (meriti,) and same priesthood. Neither the power of wealth, nor the weakness of poverty, can make a Bishop more exalted or more depressed; but they are ALL SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES. But you say, How is it that at Rome a Presbyter is ordained on the testimonial of a Deacon? Why do you cast up to me the custom of *one city*? Why do you justify this paucity, out of which has arisen a disdain for the laws of the Church? That which is scarce is the more sought after. In India, penny-royal is more costly than pepper. The paucity of the Deacons causes them to be held in honor; the multitude of the Presbyters causes them to be despised. But even in the Church of Rome, the Presbyters sit, and the Deacons stand; although, as disorders increase by degrees, I may have seen a Deacon, *in the absence of a Bishop*, sit among the Presbyters, and at domestic feasts give benediction to the Presbyters. Let those who do this know, that they do not well; and let them hear the Apostles. 'It is not meet that we should leave the word of God to serve tables.' Let them know why Deacons were appointed; let them read the Acts of the Apostles; let them remember their rank. Presbyter and Bishop: one is the name of age, the other, of *dignity*. Whence, in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, there is mention made of the ordination of Bishop and Deacon, but none of Presbyter, because the Presbyter is included in the Bishop. He who is promoted, is promoted from less to greater. Either, then, let a Deacon be ordained out of a Presbyter, that a Presbyter may be shown to be less than a Deacon," [We have known that done among New Haven Congregationalists!] "into whom he grows up from something small; or, if a Presbyter is ordained out of a Deacon, he should know that he becomes meaner in emolument, but greater in Priesthood. And that we may know the *Apostolical traditions* taken from the Old Testament, that which *Aaron* and his *sons*, and the *Le-vites*, were in the temple: that let the BISHOPS, PRESBYTERS and DEACONS claim to be in the Church."

Now, with regard to St. Jerome in general, and this testimony in particular, on which, as a dernier resort, so much stress is laid by the opponents of Episcopacy, there are several things to be said. (1.) Jerome was not an Apostolic Father.

He died A. D. 420, or in the fifth Century. (2.) Jerome, though a voluminous author, is of little authority *in matters of opinion*. The learned Dupin, says: "His genius was hot, and vehement. . . . He knew a great deal; but he never argued upon principles: which made him *sometimes contradict himself*." Mosheim says: "his bitterness against those who differed from him was extremely keen, and his thirst of glory insatiable." (3.) Jerome does *not* say, that Presbyters ordained or consecrated Bishops; but that they *nominated* them, (*nominabant*). The manner of nominating Bishops has always been diverse; some Bishops have been nominated by the Pope, others by Bishops, others by Presbyters, others by Cathedral Chapters; others by Kings and Emperors; others by Prime Ministers; others, still, (like St. Ambrose,) by the Laity of the Diocese. Our own Diocesan Bishops are nominated by a mixed convention of Clergy and Laity; but the Bishop of Montana was nominated by the House of Bishops. The *Consecration* of Bishops is quite another thing. All branches of the Catholic Church agree, that this requires the "Laying on of Hands, with prayer, of *one* lawful Bishop, to make it *valid*, and *three*, to make it regular and canonical." (4.) So far from it being true, that Jerome "declares the original parity of the Clergy," as Mr. Merriam affirms, his works are full of statements directly to the contrary. For example, he says, "For what does a Bishop, *except ordination*, which a Presbyter may not do?" He says, in his Fifty-Fourth Epistle, distinguishing between the Orthodox, and certain Heretics; "With us, the Bishops hold the place of the Apostles; with them, the Bishop is the third degree." In his Catalogue, he says; "James, immediately after our Lord's ascension, having been Ordained BISHOP of Jerusalem, undertook the charge of the Church at Jerusalem. Timothy was ordained Bishop of the Ephesians by Paul; Titus, of Crete. Polycarp was, by John, ordained BISHOP of Smyrna." Jerome is here giving, not opinions, but facts; in which he is corroborated by the whole current of Church history.

With this statement, brief as it is, we are quite willing to leave the testimony of St. Jerome. As to the Church of Alex-

andria, we give the list of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, down to the time of the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325, with the length of their Episcopates, and the time of their death, as they stood in the *Oriental Chronicle*, in order to show the minute accuracy with which the records of the Alexandrine Church had been kept. Two translations of the *Oriental Chronicle* are given in the *Byzantine Historians*, Vol. xvii., one by Ecchellenensis, the other by Assemani. The last is best, and the *Dissertations* are valuable.

	Years.	Days.		Died.	A. D.
1. St. Mark,	7				
2. Ananias,	18	216	Sunday,	Athor 20,	86
3. Melianus,	12	286	Monday,	Thoth 1,	99
4. Cerdon,	10	280	Saturday,	Paoni 11,	109
5. Primus,	12	52	Sunday,	Mesori 3,	124
6. Justus,	10	315	Saturday,	Paoni 22,	135
7. Eumenius,	10	122	Sunday,	Paophi 10,	146
8. Marcianus,	9	86	Sunday,	Tobi 6,	155
9. Claudianus,	14	183	Thursday,	Epiphi 9,	169
10. Agrippinus,	11	211	Friday,	Meehir 5,	181
11. Julianus,	10	33	_____	_____	191
12. Demetrius,	32	219	_____	_____	224
13. Heraclas,	16	56	Monday,	Choiak 8,	240
14. Dionysius,	19	281	_____	_____	261
15. Maximus,	12	211	Sunday,	Pharmuthi 14,	273
16. Theonas,	9	263	Wednesday,	Tobi 8,	284
17. Peter M.,	10	333	Friday,	Athor 29,	295
18. Archelaus,	0	200	Tuesday,	Paoni 19,	295
19. Alexander,	22	308	Monday,	Pharmuthi 22,	318
20. Athanasius,	46	15	Thursday,	Poelion 7,	364

We have, moreover, the testimony of the great Ecclesiastical historian of the Copts, Severus, Bishop of Ashmonia, whose station in the Church gave him access to all its records and who expressly states, that he had consulted the Greek and Coptic Monuments, which in his time were preserved in the Monastery of St. Macarius. Of Ananias, or Anianus, he says:

“When St. Mark heard of the Heathens’ murderous design, he constituted Anianus *Bishop* of Alexandria, and likewise three *Presbyters* and seven *Deacons*; which eleven persons he instituted for the service and confirmation of the faithful brethren. He himself, departing thence, went to the Pentapolis, and remained there two years, preaching and ordaining, or constituting *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*, in all the provinces thereof.”

Again of Julianus :—

"There was a certain *Presbyter*, a wise man, who had studied the Holy Scriptures with great diligence, whose name was Julianus, and who walked in the way of continence, religion and meekness. The *Bishops*, therefore, being assembled in *Council*, and, at the same time, the orthodox people in the city of Alexandria, and making diligent inquiry among the whole people, they found no man like this *Presbyter*. Wherefore, hands being laid upon him, they constituted him Patriarch."

In Egypt, the custom anciently was, and now is, to have a *three-fold* imposition of hands in the creation of Bishops. The votes of the people were given, and numbered by lifting up of hands, and confirmed by the laying on of hands of the principal *Laity*. [There is a *Congregational* ordination for Mr. M.] The *Presbyters* laid their hands twice on the head of the person elected, [Why here is a manifest *Presbyterian* ordination! But let us read on,] first, in giving their votes, and afterwards, their solemn approbation of his admission to the Episcopate. The *Bishops* also twice laid on their hands, first, to confirm the suffrage, and finally, at his *Consecration*. [So we are landed in Episcopacy, after all.] The following is the order prescribed in the ancient constitutions of the Church in Alexandria.

"Let the Bishop be constituted on the first day of the week, all giving their consent for his promotion, and the people and the Priests attesting for him. Let the *Bishops*, who are present to lay their hands on him, wash their hands, that *they* may then *consecrate* him, the people standing by, with silent reverence; and let them raise their hands over him, saying, 'We lay our hands upon this chosen servant of God, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to constitute him into a good and stable Order of the One, Unspotted Church of the Living, Invisible God. After these things, let the presiding Bishop (*primus Episcopus ex illis*) lay his hands upon him, and pronounce the formula of consecration (or ordination); and let all the people say, Amen.' These facts show, most conclusively, that Caius and Eutychius (933) were mistaken, and that, at Alexandria, as elsewhere, *none but Bishops ordained*. This, Jerome himself allows, in opposition to the authority he had quoted, if indeed it is quoted correctly."*

There is another thing about this Essay, which affords us much surprise. It is, that, (with the exception of one little

* Chapin's Primitive Church, pages 198-201.

foot-note,) our author affords us no evidence that he has ever heard the *clarum et venerabile nomen* of the "Father of Church History," Eusebius of Cæsarea. He constantly quotes, as his authority, the German, Neander, a converted Jew and semi-Rationalist, who flourished at Berlin a few years ago. Was this because Eusebius maintained the Primitive Episcopacy, while Neander opposed it? We hope no such unworthy motive prevailed in the Yale Seminary. Still, we know, that, at *Andover*, "the human will always yields to the stronger motive!" We recommend, then, to our Yalensian friends, a careful and unbiased study of Eusebius. We presume they read the original Greek; at any rate, Cruse's translation is faithful to the original. They will find there full and accurate Lists of the Apostolic Bishops of Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, and other Sees for the First Three Centuries.*

The anniversary Essay, which we are reviewing, sums up its *partial* survey of history, with the following theory of the origin of the Episcopate, which can lay no especial claim to originality:—There were just Twelve Apostles, who established the Church with a Ministry of One Order (Presbyters), of equal rank. These Presbyters, in various places, elected one of their number to preside, and these, 'Primi inter pares,' soon laid claim to a difference of Order, and a divine succession

* We happen to know, that when this work of Eusebius was published by subscription, the Rev. Dr. Taylor, then at the head of the Yale Theological Seminary, declared that he had never read it. Several years ago, the late Rev. Dr. Hewitt preached the Sermon before the General Association, at Westbrook, Conn. In his Sermon, he declared, in the most positive manner, that there was no Episcopacy in the Early Church; that it came in, in the latter part of the Fourth Century, amid political commotions and Doctrinal corruptions, &c. Unfortunately for the Doctor, at a public dinner on the same day, a learned, but honest, Ecclesiastical historian, who happened to be present, was asked, in presence of Dr. Hewitt, if the Statement in the Sermon concerning Episcopacy was historically correct? He answered, promptly, "No." He added, "The Church was full of Episcopacy in the Third Century. There is clear proof of Episcopacy in the Second Century. And our Episcopal friends pretend to find Episcopacy in the latter part of the First Century." The conversation here dropped. But it led to a formal request, by Dr. Hewitt, of authorities on the part of the Historian; and these, subsequently, were given, at great length. That correspondence is in our possession, and is worth publishing. We state the above, to show, that such an Essay as that before us, from such a source, is not a matter of surprise.

in the Apostles' Office. This theory will not hold water for an instant.

It is contrary to all human experience. Since the Reformation, there have been a great many Presbyterian organizations, calling themselves 'churches,' but in none of these has Episcopacy crept in in this manner. John Wesley gave the Methodists their "Bishops," (such as they were,) at the outset; the crown gave superintendents to the Lutherans, in Denmark and Germany. We still wait for the first ambitious Presbyter to claim the Apostolic Office. John Wesley expressly disclaimed it, and the Methodist Bishops disavow a distinction of *Order*, in the Apostolic Sense. In fact, every *spurious* Episcopate denies the Apostolical Succession, and every *valid* one claims it. But were the two theories any less opposed to each other in the Second Century, than in the Nineteenth?

Another fatal objection is, that it lacks all evidence in its support. It is manifestly patched up, to suit a purpose. Did the Presbyters tamely surrender their rights, without a word of protest? But there is no protest on record. Presbyterianism must have been such an abominable thing, that the authority of the Holy Apostles could not keep it afloat for twenty years! It was discarded, *nemine contradicente*! Is this a comfortable theory for a Yale Divinity student? The Papacy took a thousand years to consolidate its power, with Forged Decretals and the help of Emperors. And yet, the dogma of the Papal Supremacy (constantly protested against in its own household) has twice rent the Church asunder, first, by the Great Schism, and then, by the Protestant Reformation. Presbyterianism can degenerate into *Socinianism* in less than a hundred years, but we imagine that it would take a much longer period for it to pass, bodily, into *Episcopacy*. We prophesy, that our author, before many years, will have to choose between *the two*.

It is a well known fact, that President Dwight, after reading "Buchanan's Researches," declared, *in private*, to his friends, 'that he would never say another word against the divine origin of Episcopacy,' though he did not follow the example of his predecessor, Cutler. We hope Mr. Merriam will become as

candid, and more *disinterested*. We counsel him to procure a few of those works which Cutler and Johnson studied with such conscientious earnestness. These certainly will, if he is an honest man, change his opinions on the Ministry of the Church of Christ, and they may lead him to see and feel, that Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order are bound inseparably together. We venture to recommend, among other works, as follows :—The writings of the Apostolic Fathers, of Eusebius, of Bull, Bramhall, and Hooker ; and, of later and more popular works, Onderdonk's *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*, Hobart's *Apology*, Cooke's *Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination*, and Chapin's *Primitive Church*. If he will study these with impartiality, and with a moral courage that dare believe the truth, it is not impossible, that, when he takes his Bachelor's degree, next May, he will give the New England world another, and still better, *Essay on the Episcopate*. Nay, we are not without hopes, that, like many other good men who have gone that way before him, he will seek the humble Order of St. Stephen, with a view to "purchasing a good degree" in the Priesthood of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. The Yale Seminary, with its rich endowments, might be made the instrument of much good ; and, at any rate, we would like to see inculcated there, more correct views of "The Rise of the Episcopate as a distinct Office in the Church."

ART. VI.—A NEW ENGLAND NOVEL: BRYAN MAURICE.

Bryan Maurice, or the Seeker. By the Rev. WALTER MITCHELL. Philadelphia : J. B. Lippincott & Co. 12mo. pp. 288. 1867.

No thinking man can dwell long upon the state of religious thought in New England, without confessing himself sorely puzzled. It would be very difficult to say precisely what it is. It is shifting and transitory. It is a breaking up of the old landmarks. There is the lull of an unresting sea before the storm. The day of battle has ended. With astonishing suddenness, the brilliant influence of Theodore Parker has passed away. Channing is as one of the ancients, and has been forgotten. Emerson is an old man. Dr. Bushnell is perhaps the only religious leader left. But there is no man, as in other days, whom all recognize as the great prophet of his age. The opinions which these men held have been widely disseminated, but the day of brilliant men, who fought against Orthodoxy and Slavery, has gone.

But there are certain signs which are very marked. The preachers of the denominations have very little hold upon the popular mind. What they do outside of their calling, their pronouncements on public matters, the books they write, the periodicals they contribute to, are what mainly calls public attention to them. Their priestly character, (which indeed they never had, and now do not pretend to have,) is chiefly uncared for and not respected. They are looked upon as public religious lecturers. And this valuation of clergymen has extended even to the Church, so that, in some quarters, our Priests are held to be behind the age, to lack moral courage and honesty, and even to be men of very ordinary ability, because they do not put forth strongly their personal opinions on the political and social questions of the day.

The neglect of religious training is bringing up the coming

generation in semi-paganism. One-day-in-the-week religion is the only system known or practised. Even in such a conservative State as Connecticut, there is no religious teaching in the Public Schools. When we consider the training of the Sunday School in the denominations, its incompleteness, its want of a definite and practical system, and remember that this is an excuse for Christian training in the family, the weakness of the religious influence over the young is easily seen. That thorough teaching of the Catechism to the baptized child, which is too imperfectly the practice even in the Church, is entirely unknown in the denominations. Whatever hold the Sunday School may have upon children when quite young, it amounts to nothing when it ought to have some restraint upon ripening manhood and womanhood. The children of New England may be broadly said to be growing up in religious ignorance. There, the air is full of the skeptical opinions, which Parker, Mann, Emerson and others, have scattered by means of the lecture system; and the children, who are thoroughly disciplined in the excellent (merely intellectual) schools, catch up these as the substitute for a Faith. The heart is entirely divorced from the head in culture, and a refined and subtle Infidelity, at best a bald Deism, is gradually spreading in places, where ten years ago the ring of "Orthodox" teaching was clear and full.

The literary Magazines published in New England, and the tone of the greater portion of the Daily Press, are in favor of this educated Deism. The denominations are powerless to meet it, because they have helped to create it. The Church of Rome, with her spurious Catholicity, does not understand it, and, except through the Missions of the Paulists, has little influence upon it, outside of Boston. Every month this widespread contagion is gathering strength. Radical movements are started, and find abundant supporters, not only in Boston, but in nearly every village where this Boston literature finds its way. It is a continual drift,—now this way, now that. Solitary thinkers, strong men, who in utter despair of a Faith have taken refuge in themselves, and who are not known as writers or teachers, have a great and persuasive influence. There is

no hot-bed of heresy in these days like a New England village. And yet the precise state of religious opinion, save as we may gather its tendencies from the causes which have created it, cannot easily be stated. It is a time of development and drift, a time which needs watching most carefully, a time which the Church cannot pass by because engaged in her own work.

If there is any quarter in the wide world, where we need to station Missionaries, and where we need Missionary Bishops who thoroughly understand the temper of the people they have to do with, and who unite with an Apostolic zeal an Apostolic clear-headedness, it is in the ancient territory of the Puritans. And Massachusetts, as the fountain-head of all American heresy, should be the scene of a Missionary devotion, which equals our zeal in laying in advance the Christian foundations of the West. New England thought largely affects our whole country, and in New England that thought should be moulded and controlled. We need, therefore, in this part of our land, among other things, and perhaps first of all, a living Episcopate; an Episcopate, which aims at nothing short of the rescue of every man, woman and child, from the present religious teaching. If the Episcopate is anything, it is the chief centre of guidance and direction. It must be on the ground. It must represent the Church as a body adapted to the country and the people. It has been the bitterly felt weakness of the Episcopate in New England, that it was too much a show-figure, paraded occasionally for purposes of Confirmation and Ordination. The Dioceses of Maine and Connecticut must be exceptions to such a statement. There the Bishops have happily taken the lead. But, throughout all New England, the Church has had the show and position, far more than we like to acknowledge, of a Sect which was remarkably bigoted, and could not pray outside of a book.

The first thing to be done to change this attitude of the Church to the people, is to put active Missionary Bishops at the head of each Diocese. That such Bishops, free from the care of Parishes and able to take the lead in every Church enterprise, would gladly be welcomed, has been shown in the hearty reception of Bishop Neely, and in the recent movements to divide the Dioceses of Massachusetts and Connecticut, which

mark the beginning of a new era. There is Missionary work in both, which needs entirely the active, inspiring, directing presence of a Bishop. But we imply that with such a Bishop goes a good deal more. It has been said, that, if Bishop Clark would stump the State of Rhode Island for the Church, he would carry every thing before him. If an active Bishop should do the same for Central or Western Massachusetts, there would be a call for Church Services in nearly every township. Then he could send his Clergy ; then he could organize his Schools ; then he could send out his book-bawkers ; then he could meet the rising Theism of the country, both with the Preacher's voice and with the written Word ; and then he could show that Christian Education and a rational Christianity were not a fiction nor a myth. Some such movement as this, something which shall show to skeptical Yankees that we *are* the Catholic Church, and therefore more evangelical than any Sect, and more liberal in a true charity than any heretical body, is demanded in this day, if we intend to win New England, or any large part of it, to the Church.

It will be some time before this is done, though there are many movements in the right direction. Meanwhile, the press is doing its own work, in putting the Church before the New England mind. There are recent books, written in explanation and defence of the Church, which are having a large circulation, and which, we doubt not, have made hundreds of converts. But yet we are of the opinion, and we expressed it some time ago in these pages,* that the Novel may be made a great agent in this general education. It may not reach so many readers as some of the books to which we have referred, but we have always thought, (and "*Bessie Melville*" is a case in point,) that the Novel might be made very useful to help on the best interests of the Church. There is some objection to a Religious Novel. It is a part of that unreasonable prejudice against Fiction, which makes some people afraid of everything which is not matter of fact. The success of such Fictions as "*Amy Herbert*" and "*The Laneton Parsonage*," shows clearly, that the Novel may be the organ of certain views, and be none the

* April, 1863, p. 21.

less valuable as a literary work. Then, there is hardly a Novel written in these days, which has not a purpose behind it, and whatever the story may teach, is thus set before the reader in a life-like reality. He may not be carried over by argument, but the Fiction has taken hold of his feelings and made an impression. In this sense the Novel has been a most powerful teacher. It has helped on whatever cause it has advocated.

It is strange, therefore, that any should object to the Religious Novel, especially to a well-reasoned story like "Bryan Maurice." Yet this very story has been thus faulted, because a Unitarian could make the case out equally attractive for his side. It is indeed certain, that the skilful Novel Writer can easily make the worse appear the better reason. But we deny that Unitarianism could ever be tricked out into a successful argument like that which the Church presents. It is too dry and dead a Faith for that. If it has beauty, it is the chilling beauty of an iceberg. We know practically of few books more genial or attractive or useful, than Religious Novels, such for instance as Dr. Lowell's "New Priest," and the work in hand. Why should not a Religious Novel exercise the same influence in degree, which a Reform or Society Novel has? And if the truths of our Faith can be set forth, in opposition to many popular notions, through the attractive medium of Fiction, should we not employ this agency to its fullest extent? It has always seemed to us, that, if persons of ability would make the Novel the vehicle of Church teaching, and not merely pious trash, a great work might be done in New England. Such a work would be popular, and, if it dealt with real life, valuable. We wrote prophetically, four years ago, as follows :

"There is a Novel yet to be written, which shall grasp the various elements of unbelief lying around us, and set them forth in comparison with the system of the Church. It requires an intimate knowledge of the inward religious experience of the Sects; it requires a genial and cheerful disposition; it requires well-trained literary abilities; nay, it requires genius of the first order, to write a work which shall gather up the delusions of sectarian zeal, and set them in order beside the candid and temperate teaching of the Church. * * * And the author of this work must be a person of the largest charity. He must know how to pour oil upon the troubled waters; he must be able to draw a rapier with a smile—to speak the severest truths with a friendly look. And such a work, fair to the sectarian who has hon-

estly inherited his religious belief, and fair in its exposition of truth, could not fail, with the blessing of God, to win many wanderers back to the Israel of God. Where is the writer, competent to this task? Who has the calm reason and imaginative power, which shall cut right and left, like an Egyptian scythe-chariot, among the heresies of New England?"

If we had then known the author of this work, and could have given him our whole idea of an American Church Novel, we could not have selected a better man for the task, or hardly have imagined a more successful embodiment of our idea. We have been greatly pleased with "Bryan Maurice." It made an impression as it came out in the pages of our only Monthly Magazine, but that impression has passed into delightful surprise in the continuous reading. Mr. Mitchell has had every advantage for the writing of this work. A graduate of Harvard, acquainted in the literary circle, of Boston, until lately a regular contributor to *The Atlantic*, formerly an Editor, and thoroughly conversant with New England intellectual and social life, probably no man could have been selected, to show the weakness of Unitarianism, and how one may be guided to the Church through this many-tangled web of Heresy, who was more entirely competent to this task. He had both the literary and religious experience, and, withal, the prime intellectual ability to make a successful book.

We place "Bryan Maurice," therefore, at the head of our American Church Novels. It is not only a Religious Novel, written evidently with the main purpose of guiding inquiring minds to embrace the Church on intelligent grounds, but a first class literary performance. It would stand high by itself. It is a well compacted, carefully worked-out, richly illustrated Novel. Not that it is too condensed or over-loaded. It is not. But it has enough material for a dozen popular Novels, and yet is not heavy. Even its discussions are not wearisome; in very few cases are they too much prolonged, and in more they are original and well put. Like every work which enters at all into religious questions, it makes demands upon the reader, but it is only the necessary demand of an intellectual process. Its value is, that it is a simple, life-like, faithful portraiture of New England religious life, especially the lights and shades of Unitarianism; and, from considerable acquaint-

ance with what these are, we can say that they are fairly presented. We know just what the ignorance of these people is. We concede all their good points as gladly as any one, but we know, alas! their terrible deficiencies as a religious people, and we are thankful that one, who has been through it all, and who has no disposition to be unfair, has given so faithful a picture. The book is so able that it will command attention in the quarters for which it was intended. It is not above or below the mark. It hits square. We have never seen the Church so well put before a New England audience. It is a book written for the times. The author says :

"As a picture of the world in which it moves, [the story] is drawn just as faithfully, just as conscientiously, as the writer's pen had power to trace it. * * * He has permitted himself to draw no ideal scenes or characters, but has put the real men and women, the real events which he knows, as they were, or as they might have been, before your eyes."

The educated New England mind has a certain course to run. Trained in moral culture, it is filled with any number of loose half-truths or mere speculations. Breaking away from these, it turns at once to a positively asserted Faith, and that is Romanism. If not captured by the speciousness of Rome, it is chilled and falls back upon its own ground. It is then in a receptive state, but needs to have a Faith built up. It is here that the Church very often comes in, with a positive, intelligent, and rational Faith, and replaces mere notions and wild conceits with solid and vital truth. Then the mind advances, and after much skirmishing and many struggles, "the depths of the New England pride of reason" are sounded, and the fold of the Catholic Church is entered. Then comes another process. It is that of unlearning, and rebuilding, with a mind and heart submissive and rightly directed, and then finally, after some years, one arrives at a comprehension of the Faith, at once Catholic, rational, and strong. This is the process of re-making, which is constantly going on. It is varied in some cases from this standard, but, in every reasoning mind, this is substantially the outline. It is this which Mr. Mitchell follows. The book will be, for this reason, all the more welcome for the seekers to whom its guidance is offered.

The story has little movement. It is mostly a record of intellectual and religious life. It begins in Rome, with Maurice as a young Harvard graduate gone abroad, and introduces him to what the Church of Rome has to offer to a young man in search of a Faith. It introduces him also to the Priest, who is by and by to become his chief spiritual guide, in the person of the Rev. Mr. Gardiner, whose resemblance to a certain Ecclesiastic many will note for themselves; and, through him, he gains his first idea of the Catholic Church. "I think," Maurice says, "I should like a Church with a Bible in its hand—for somehow I have come to see that there is a Church somewhere, and I cannot feel that the Bible is just an ordinary book." That Church, Gardiner gradually introduces him to. The celebration of the Holy Communion at the bedside of the dying Frank Goodstowe, makes a strong impression upon him. An idea crops out, in the remark of a young English officer, which is worth quoting, as showing precisely what Maurice was in search of: "I can't say what I mean, but—but a man must believe, if he has a work to do in the world, and got to be under fire, and do his duty by a lot of these poor ignorant soldiers. By Jove, if I didn't believe, I should have gone to the bad long ago." The easy young chaps who discuss religion, the Papal ceremonies, the efforts of the Propaganda for his conversion, the female acquaintances made, and the glimpses of infidel acquaintances brought in to relieve the picture, almost crowd it with life. There is a slight glance at English life, and there is a sailor's idea of the Christian belief, which is admirably put, though of course not meant to be a final or exhaustive statement. Then comes the passage home, and the shipwreck, in which, to all knowledge, the heroine of the story is lost, Maurice is picked up by a fishing smack, from a floating spar, and saved. A pious old captain gives him an idea of religion, which he never had before. Then he goes to Harvard, and, by the connivance of certain men, enters the Divinity School, with high hopes of the great "*Broad Church of the Future.*"

Here, Parkerism is at its height, and its incompleteness is as aptly shown as Emersonianism was at Rome. If this is a true picture of the Harvard School, and we may suppose it to be,

we do not wonder at the decline of Unitarianism. Here he makes new acquaintances, and has a glimpse of the Church occasionally. He tests Unitarianism on its own ground. With high hopes he is finally sent off to Connecticut, and by way of Broadwater, where he visits the Cranmer School,—(the place and the School will be recognized by our readers,)—he goes to Norowam, a Connecticut village near the sea-coast, to begin his ministry, as an unbaptized and unordained Unitarian divine, in the care of an Universalist Society. Here the various sectarian elements of a New England village are brought into play,—Methodist, Baptist, Congregational and Universalist,—and Maurice makes a decided impression. But, when he comes into actual contact with sin and death, and attempts to do something besides preach attractive sermons, he breaks down utterly. The scene at Mr. Graham's bedside is powerfully drawn, and the Church's ministrations in sickness were never more faithfully or aptly pictured. A young priest, named Winthrop, here figures with good grace, and this part of the work is perhaps better done than the earlier, if we can make a distinction ; for the author throws himself more entirely into it. His sympathy enters into his subject. His contrast of the orderly and effective methods of the Church with those of the denominations, is marked and strong, and, though the temptation of course is to be unjust to them, we, who have seen both sides, think that it is fair.

The story now rapidly culminates. Maurice is entirely disgusted with his ministry. He has seen constantly some new feature of the Church. He has found that the young Priest Winthrop, with less ability than himself, is enabled to do far more, because he has a Church behind him, and a plan and a system, adapted to the conditions of human life before him. Gardiner then comes in, and there is a very frank discussion of the principles and system of the Church, and one, in which we have never seen Church principles more reasonably or intelligently stated. It is made rational to an unchurchly mind, which is a rare merit in our teachings for others.

Maurice at last yields, and goes to the Cranmer School, where he is baptized and confirmed. The description of this

Baptism and Confirmation is done with great delicacy and beauty. Subsequently he goes to Philadelphia, where in a certain Church he meets the young lady who had won his heart on the voyage home from England, and whom he had supposed to be lost ; and the curtain gradually lowers, till, his studies completed, he is left the Rector of a Parish established on true Church principles, and has become a thoroughly changed and useful man.

Such the story. But this gives only the faintest hint of the wealth of illustration and intelligent discussion, in which the narrative is imbedded. Some of these discussions we had marked for quotation, but no detached portions will do the work justice ; it must be read connectedly, and as a whole. The parts, which we had selected, are the discriminating observations of one whose large experience gives his sayings an unusual authority ; and they are apt and suggestive, beyond anything which we have seen before. The work leads one out of the miserable Skepticism of the day, into the region of Positive Truth, and into a truly Christian spirit and home. Other books on this subject leave the reader as they find him, dissatisfied, restless, without guidance or comfort ; this gives him a true standing-place, and makes him an intelligent Christian believer. Its style is sharp and clear ; it avoids mere sentiment ; the author writes very little for effect, but rather with that full heart and mind which wield a rapid pen.

We have found much to admire in this volume, because it is a thoroughly good book, and one which, as Churchmen, we cannot overlook ; one which, as an agent in religious change, we are in conscience bound to make use of to the utmost extent. We have done too little to encourage a native Church Literature. Mr. Mitchell has accomplished a great work, and we have now to do our part to make the book what its author could most wish it to be,—a counter-wave upon the sea of New England religious unrest. Hence, let every Rector have copies for lending, in his own library ; let copies be placed in the Parish Library ; let every intelligent Churchman give it to the bright men and women who have been influenced by the opinions it is calculated to meet ; and then the book will be helped on to do its destined work.

ART. VII.—THE ABBE GUETTEE ON THE PAPACY.

The Papacy ; by the ABBE GUETTEE. Translated by the Rt. Rev. A. CLEVELAND COXE, D. D., Bishop of Western New York. New York : Carleton. 1867.*

THERE are two titles, respectfully distinguishing the great Eastern and Western branches of the European Church, which are more felicitous than usually chances. They serve to mark, not only the pretensions, but the tendencies of each division. They designate integral facts in the life of each. These words are 'Catholic' and 'Orthodox.' They are no mere claims of pretence. Rome has been content to sacrifice her Orthodoxy to the one fierce endeavor of keeping her *Catholicism* (we use the word in contradistinction to the rightful term, *Catholicity*) intact. The Greek Christianity, emerging from its terrible struggles over the standards of the Faith, has sunk down into a deadness, like the stupor of a person dragged from the breakers of a sea-beach, and flung, prone and motionless, upon the wet sands. It dares not put forth a single effort to restore a lost Unity, lest that endanger the precious deposit of the Creeds. Before one can study, with full advantage, the able and exhaustive work, whose title we have placed at the head of this Article, it will be necessary to enter into the consideration of those broad topics, which we have just sought to indicate in a leading sentence.

It is obvious to any who will reflect, that Christianity, though always in the concrete form of a Church, came to the Eastern mind more in the power of an Idea, than of an Institution. In other words, it was more valuable for its thoughts, than for its mechanism. It came, at the first, in the uncongenial shape of a Jewish Sect. Until the fervid genius of St. Paul freed it from those swaddling bands, it had small influence upon the general mind of the East. It appealed to the Greeks, chiefly through one leading thought, that of the Resurrection from the Dead. It appealed to men accustomed to philosophic

inquiry, and wonted to consider ideas wholly apart from the natural business of men. Christianity, introduced into a system of almost absolute religious toleration, had, no more than Platonism or Stoicism, a chance of direct collision with the Heathen World, until it took the shape of apparent treason to the Empire, by denying the sacrifice to deified Emperors and resisting the Cæsar's mandates.

Hence, while persecution knit its members to the One Body, by links which no fire could melt, no force dis sever, and while the Church possessed, from the first, an objective Unity and life, that Unity and that life were not the foremost objects in men's thoughts concerning it. Until it had, by the conversion of Constantine, gained a foot-hold in the Imperial Government itself, it had hardly a visible status among men, considered merely as citizens, as members of the body-politic. Therefore, it is not strange, that Belief should make the terms of Communion, rather than Communion decide the Rule of Belief.

Let us not be misunderstood here. We do not deny that the Church was an Institution, in visible shape, and according to ordered forms, from the first day of its existence. We regard, as the most imbecile of assumptions, the theory of a Church created by the gradual voluntary consent of Christians. Men became Christians only by coming into the Church. There was no other way possible. But what we mean is this. Because of this very inevitableness, the Church was not the prominent thought in men's minds. It was taken as the condition precedent of the doctrine. Initiation was, to the Greek experience, the one approved method of gaining truth ; and it was accustomed to look beyond the ceremony, to the significance.

With the entrance of the Church upon its new era, a great, and, in brief, an inevitable change, took place. The Faith was not yet determined. We use this last word advisedly, in its stricter sense. It was all there, but in language, in definitions, thus far sufficing, but now bending under the pressure of the subtle thought of the most acute philosophizers the world has ever known. At this very moment, the reconciling hand of external persecution was suddenly lifted, and the foremost

places of the Church became, instead of posts of peril, the objects of ambition. Power, pomp, political sway, the goods of this world, were suddenly laid at the feet of the astonished Church. She was brought into alliance with a State, in which intrigue, lust, and all the corrupt and corrupting influences of the time had raged, without let or hindrance. It is to us a proof of her divine authority and nature, that she yielded as little as she did, to the enormous temptation. But she did yield. A new motive, a personal one, was infused into the hearts of her Clergy, to advance themselves by sharper criticism, of those above, and as the Faith was the one paramount thought of the Church, so it became the battle-ground of all worldly passions, as well as the gladiatorial arena for the loftiest intellects. This at once serves to account for the bitterness, with which the great theological battles of the Nicene Era were carried on, and for the narrow compass in which they were fought.

It also accounts for another fact, of no small moment here. The whole history of that great struggle is fruitful in instances of important concessions or assumptions ; the consequences of which were altogether unsuspected at the time. The great Arian dispute arose out of the effort to avoid an earlier Heresy, which was forgotten as soon as the larger issue became apparent. So, too, with the succeeding controversies of Nestorian, Eutychian, Macedonian,—each arose out of an incautious attempt at severity of Orthodoxy, upon some other and contrasted point. But, in the midst of the battle, the combatants were rearing intrenchments, and taking positions, which, for future campaigns, were to have momentous consequences, then little apprehended. Thus the word *Deipara*, applied, as a title, to the Blessed Virgin, not to honor her, but to prove the unity of the Divine and Human Natures of our Blessed Lord,—became a future argument for the Mariolatry which now is. So, the effort of a party restored to power, to do honor to the memory of a deceased leader, whom they could no longer restore to his Patriarchate, or replace in his See, led to that reckless canonization, which has issued in the vast system of Saint Worship. So the credulous, but loving, resort to the posthumous test of

Miracles, to certify the Orthodoxy of those who had passed beyond the reach of Councils and Synods, developed into the whole imposture of relics and sacred places.

But, perhaps the least anticipated danger was the greatest, which grew out of this same strife. The attempt to claim authority for a disputed dogma, was furthered by the ability to produce the adherence of a powerful See. Especially was this the case, when the support was invoked of the Civil Magistrate, whose whole habit of mind led him to be more moved by authority than argument. If Rome assented to such a statement, was not Rome the Chair of Peter? 'Have we not the mind of Paul, when we produce the sanction of the Bishop of the Apostolic See of the West?' The door was at once opened to concessions, then little appreciated. The seeds of future usurpations were sown,—as will ever be the case, when men meet in hot debate over single and transient issues. They were like gamblers above their board, who, to win the present hazard, set to stake the title deeds of future empires and estates, of whose extent they were recklessly unconscious.

In the mean time, the great Western Patriarchate was growing up, in a great degree removed from these debates; was taking more and more the form of that Catholic Institution, which it has ever since preserved. Two things contributed especially to this. Rome was the Imperial City. Let the Empire grow or shrink as it might, Rome was the unchanging historic centre of Imperialism. Not even the determined Orientalism of the later Emperors could make of Byzantium other than the New Rome, the feeble copyist of the great Capital. Rome was also, as regarded Christianity, a frontier post. Its Missionary activity was kept alive by the constant stimulus of an outlying heathenism. Missionaries care little for controversies within the Church. Like the generals of the Empire encamped in Dacia, Pannonia, or Britain, who were bound to keep the borders, whatever the plots and conspiracies of the Capital, who were loyal to their eagles, whether they bore them in the name of Caligula or Antonine, so the remoter Bishops of the Western Patriarchate asked only for the authorized statements of the Creeds, leaving the Conciliar assemblies to

determine between '*homōousion*' and '*homoiousion*' '*monophysite*' and '*monothelite*.'

But the Imperial tradition, the Roman political supremacy, never lost its hold. There was always this vast difference between the East and West, that while the victorious march of Rome was submitted to by the one, as a terrible, but inevitable fate, by the other it was felt as the greatest of boons. The Greek could not look upon his little peninsula, without everywhere seeing the relics of a Civilization, which taught him to despise the men of iron and clay, to whom he paid tribute, and to whose luxury he was the supple but contemptuous pander.

Throughout the broader realm of the conquest of Alexander, and the magnificent heritage of his four great Captains, all that the eye looked upon was the work of Greek genius, or of an elder culture, still more majestic and mysterious. Antioch, Alexandria, the Asian cities, were Greek to the core. Nay, over all the thought, all the refinement, all the splendor of life, the Greek intellect still bore sway. Greek was the Court language, even in the Cæsar's palace ; Greek Literature was the model of Latin aspirations.

But not so with the West. The Gaul, the Britain, the German, might chafe at the yoke, but he could not but own, that he owed all the goods of his life to Roman arts, Roman discipline, and Roman laws. His mud-huts, his barbarous attire, his savage misrule, had disappeared, leaving no monuments behind. He was proud, perforce, of the citizenship that gave to him the stately temples, the luxurious baths, the noble roads, which, straight as the lightning, clove his woods and morasses. Above all, he rejoiced in the broad and enlightened jurisprudence, which, to this day, makes the basis of all European Law, and regulates the dealing of man with man, from the capes of Sicily to the shores of the Baltic. Conquered by the superior martial might of the Roman, he had become, not the slave, but the soldier of the Conqueror, and beneath those same eagles, had marched, triumphantly, beyond the Orontes and the Nile.

These differences, so little heeded so long as the great convergent power kept East and West alike in thrall, were there, like contending currents, ready to flow against each other, whenever the hurricane of Imperial conquest and centralization died into the fitful gales of the later Empire. To the West, then, the name of Rome was essentially precious, and it was more than natural, it was inevitable, that the rising Church should supplant the waning Empire; that Christianity, which had come to it as an Institution, should be looked at rather in its form than in its idea.

Another difference must be noted in aid of this. Christianity had come to the East, to take the place of an outworn Religionism. The Greek gave up the dreary fables, which he no longer believed, and gladly resigned the legends of Orcus, and the Stygian lake, and the gloomy Plutonian realms, for the glorious Resurrection of the Body. The Western barbarian laid down his superstitions, in which he wholly lived and believed, at the foot of the conquering Churchman, whose life showed a sublimer Faith, and more heroic manliness. The power of Institutions overcame him. The Church marched upon him in the panoply of her vestments, her ritual, and her sanctity. Instead of the debates in the Schools of Philosophy, and the secret circulation of new truths by unfriended Missionaries meeting in upper rooms, the Ecclesiasticism of the Western Christianity was in the fore-front. It might be a Monk uplifting the Cross before the shrines of Odin or Freya, or a Bishop plucking the trefoil from the sward, to illustrate the Doctrine of the Trinity; but it was ever a wiser, nobler, mightier than himself, who claimed his allegiance. The might of men was felt at the West, as the power of Ideas at the East. Hence, the dominant thought of the Western Patriarchate was, always, the Church, as that of the East was Christianity.

It is to these two conflicting tendencies, that the world owes the Papacy. We are the more desirous to make this plain, because it meets those two fallacies of the early Oxford Movement, which sent their authors to Rome, viz: the Development Theory of Dr. Newman,—the Incarnation Theory of Archdeacon Wilberforce. Each of these theories represents

the Papacy as the necessity of the life of the whole Church. Each sees it from his own stand-point. Mr. Newman seized upon the idea of a progressive life in the Church, which gave it the power, and the right to shape a Faith for Christendom, in order that unbelief might ever find, lying in its way, a rock, against which it must be shattered. Mr. Wilberforce pictured to himself the fiction of a Body necessitated to a Visible Centre of Unity, and which, through gradations of Archbishoprics, Provincials, Metropolitans, and Patriarchates, culminated in a Bishop of all Bishops. Mr. Newman has sought his Orthodox Church in an ever-shifting oracle. Mr. Wilberforce, his Catholic Church in an institution, which could only arise upon the ruins of Catholicity. Both have done so, by shutting their eyes to the records and the arguments, which the Book we are reviewing places in the fullest light.

And we have endeavored to show, in these brief generalizations, what we believe to be really the case, that the Faith was evolved, that is, the dogmatic statements of the Faith, by means which wholly ignored the Papal method, by Councils, by debates, by constant reference to the past, by careful avoidance of any pretence to other right of decision than the possession of primitive and unchanging Truth; and also, that the centralizing of the Church, as an Institution, was accident and oversight, not springing from the need of a Centre of Unity, but from utter carelessness of such a thought. For the facts and the reasonings, we refer to the clear, concise statements of the Abbé's book. We have also striven to show, that the necessity, which lay at the very foundation of the Eastern Church, was, that its Centre of Unity should be the Creed, not localized in any See, however ancient and Apostolic, but, wherever professed, being at once the test and rallying-point; and, also, that other necessity, that the Church in the West should leave to others the main task of elaborating that Symbol, while ceaselessly pushing its own concentrated and dominating authority.

Hence, our effort thus far has been to show, that neither the Orthodox Faith, nor the System of the Papacy, was the work of an united Church; that in one section of it, Catholicity

was the predominant desire, in the other, Orthodoxy. The East had no conception of vital severance of Unity, other than Heresy. If all believed alike, all were in the true Church, whether submitted to the rule of Cyprian, or of Gregory Nazianzen. The latent, and then the developed idea of the West was, that severance lay in Schism. If all held by the Apostolic Chair, all must be in the truth. To the one, the '*veritas*' made the '*consensus*,' to the other, the '*consensus*' made the '*veritas*.' Happily, for Christendom, these two opposing powers were not to meet in the plenitude of their strength. The Western development was in abeyance during the whole, or nearly the whole of the great battle of the Creeds. The Abbé Guettée has shown this most conclusively, in the forcible way in which he has put Rome's own disclaimers. Indeed, we think, that not the lightest merit of the book is the clear picture, which he has given of the actual drift of the Western Patriarchate toward the Papacy, in the very midst of its unquestionably sincere denials of any such intent. Institutions are as men. 'Some are born great, some achieve greatness, some have greatness thrust upon them.' The Papacy displays, in turn, somewhat of all these contingencies. By the Imperialism of its Roman cradle, it was, undoubtedly, *porphyro-genitus*, born to the repute of Empire; by the disputes and decay of the East, its central authority was, in a measure, thrust upon it; and, at the last, awakening to both these facts, it set itself steadily to the work of achieving greatness. Perhaps the one omission of the Book,—though some may feel that it lay outside the task of the writer's proposing to himself,—is in this, that it does not show the splendor of the inheritance into which the Papacy came, through the possession of a Faith already determined and ascertained.

But the Abbé has preferred, it may be wisely, to fight within narrower limits. His task has been to show, first, the absence of any original and Scriptural claim to a primitive Headship of the Church; next, its defect of Conciliar authority; and, last, the direct usurpation by which that power was seized, maintained, and enlarged.—For the manner in which he has done this work, we have only admiration; and whether it shall be

studied in his brilliant original, or in the clear and masterly translation, we feel sure it will be satisfactory. We wish to show to the reader, who stands apart from the immediate battle, and to whom the Abbé's conclusions have long since been foregone, what place he is to give this work upon his shelves. The mere details of the Roman controversy may be to us, of the Anglican Communion, as little interesting as the Nag's Head controversy and the papers of the Reformation, to a Russo-Greek. But to every true Churchman, it must be always a most deeply interesting and momentous study, to trace the broader workings of the Guiding Spirit of Truth. It is no question, which can hinge upon the authenticity of a document, or the interpretation of a passage in the Fathers. It goes to the very life and being of that Church, which, in spite of Schism, is always One; which, in spite of the deadness of uniformity, is always living, so long as it shall keep its true outward and inward Unity with the One Head and Ruler and Lord.

We have said, that the two impulses did not join battle in the vigor of each. We desire to state this once more. The one is Orthodoxy, the dominion of an Idea, of right opinion. It is, of its own nature, conservative. When the perfection of statement is reached in the words of a Creed, it must pause. It cannot enunciate anew. It is bound to *keep* the Faith once delivered to the saints. It cannot add new matter, because the Creed is an organic Unity. Many things are true, which are not in the Constantinopolitan Symbol, but they have no right there, because it is complete in regard to what it states.

But the Church is Catholic. It is for all men's needs, in all time. Hence, as a Church, it may expand the Creed into Liturgies, varying in time and place, hedge it about with Articles, few, many, philosophic, æsthetic, dogmatic, or eirenic; may lowly bow the head at the Beloved Name, because of the presence of unbelief, or stand erect in fear of the formalism which sacrifices the spiritual substance to the show. The Catholic spirit and temper is ever varying, adapting, developing, leaving behind. Only, the one cannot forsake the other. God has joined them, let none presume to put them asunder. We need

the unchanging, the changeless Symbol, as the Centre of Unity. We need the Catholic Church, the constant and faithful interpreter, lest the words of truth and soberness die into unmeaning mutters upon our lips. Let us recognize the great, the living work of the Western Patriarchate,—the Church in the West,—in preserving and making effective the power of an objective, embodied Christianity. Let us, while we do it, also fearfully lay to heart its awful error. For, when the Church in the West cut loose, though in the single article of the unwarranted *Filioque*, from the Faith of the past, she entered upon the pathway to her fall. She assumed the right, in which lay all the wrong, to speak from her own chair, from her own lips. The principle of the Papacy,—and none ought to rise from the perusal of this book without seeing it,—is to sacrifice all things to its own pretensions. For the Unity which is based upon Communion with the Chair of St. Peter, the Papacy has changed, is changing, the Orthodox Faith. It must be so. When error is strong enough, it must trim its sails to meet the veering of the breeze.

In one of his most brilliant, most untruthful and superficial essays, the late Lord Macaulay has sketched the mode in which Rome, in contrast with the Anglican Church, deals with superstition and fanaticism. It is her destiny. The course of the Anglican Church toward the Whitefields and the Wesleys, need not be defended,—we know, too late, its narrowness and its error. But it is the error of the true and faithful wife, needlessly jealous and prudish though she be. Better that, than the graceful smiles and courteous yielding of the wanton, who will sacrifice all else, rather than let a single lover break from her thralldom. To keep that Unity, Rome can close her eyes to every frailty, can tolerate every offense, save the one of ceasing to wear her colors and profess her allegiance.

In nought is this Book more valuable, than in the way in which it demonstrates the one conclusion, that the Papacy is the source of all Rome's error. It is not a point which can ever be yielded. For no eirenic hopes, can the Catholic Church be moved to any concessions which shall leave this, the root of bitterness, undestroyed. Rome cannot

reform. She can never become Catholic, but by ceasing to become Roman. Were the Photian Schism undone, were East and West once more to commune at a common Altar, the work would be advanced not one hair's breadth, unless, at that Altar's foot were laid down, forever, the pretensions of the Papacy. We are glad that this point has been so strongly put by the Abbé Guettée. There are men who are forever dreaming of re-union with Rome, by virtue of some Concordat, which shall return to the old starting point before some fancied usurpation or fatal deviation in Doctrine. They cannot see that these are not excrescences, but fruits of the Roman System; that there can be no purity of Religion, no soundness of Faith, no certainty of the moral life, in a body, of which the cardinal principle is, to secure its own existence, which, as the first article of its true Creed, holds its own being as necessary to the world's salvation.

The thirst for power has become, to Romanism, what the lust of Gold was to old Trapbois, the miser in Scott's 'Fortunes of Nigel.' "Have no dealings with my father, for, simple as he seems, he will surely cheat you," said his daughter. And so, wherever else Rome may be weak, hers is the fierce and sleepless cunning, with which no bargain can be except at a ruinous price. Decrepid in all else, it is her one surviving faculty, the *instinct of domination*. And, like the old miser, Rome only cares to hoard the empire which she cannot use. She clings to the name Catholic, though all Catholicity be gone, though she is the one obstacle to all real Catholicity. In this it is hopeless to look for reform, and without reform in this, Union cannot be. No amount of concessions in special points, can ever be of value to her opponents, so long as there is left that one power, which nullifies all concessions; that power, from which sprang all abuses and encroachments, the Supremacy of the Papacy. No one truism has been more frequently verified by the experience of the conclave, than the Pope elect ceased to be the Cardinal who was chosen. It is like the charge which so often passed upon the Cæsars of Rome Imperial. Indeed, it is a fruit of the same tree, changed by transplantation, but not transformed; at heart bearing the deadly

juices of the same evil root. Imperialism, the undying tradition of Rome, survived the Empire, to pass into the Church.

M. Guettée has clearly discerned this great transition point, as the true period of Roman corruption. It is all-important. We have said that the contest between the two principles, Orthodoxy and Catholicity, did not take place in the vigor of each. It could hardly have arisen. It was necessary for Orthodoxy to be first established, and to pass from the active to the passive state, ere the desire for Catholicism, according to the Roman idea, should be awakened. Not till the Faith was predominantly settled, could there be any *depositum*, so to speak, of the Faith in a single centre. The Church at large must outgrow the period of debating the Creeds, before it could seek to enforce them.

This period was coincident with the fall of the Western Empire, and the decay of the Eastern intellect. A new, barbaric, but healthy material, was poured into the mould of the Western Patriarchate. Hitherto, in spite of the Monasticism of the East, the tendency toward Celibate Institutions, and the many corruptions of the sub-Nicene Era, there had been no radical *Ecclesiasticism*, no generic separation of the Clergy from the Laity. But, as we have briefly shown in our previous outline of the tendency of the two great divisions of the Church, this was all ready to ripen in the West. The irruption of the barbarians completed this. Then arose, at once, the great severance of the peoples into two classes; Men and Priests. In an age, when to bear arms was the normal occupation of mankind, there was but one refuge from the ways of war, which could be taken without dishonor,—the cloister and the tonsure. To every woman the alternative, to be guarded by an husband's sword, or a nun's veil. And, at once, there arose, also, the ceaseless struggle between Civil authority and Ecclesiastical independence. Every step of the Church was, henceforth, almost a logical necessity. The Church moved forward to a continual conquest; but, as the necessary accompaniment of her victorious march, was compelled to concentrate and rally around the Papal centre. The Papacy became the Covenant Ark, about which the tribes were marshalled,

before which the armies of the aliens were put to flight. Beginning with the vow of Celibacy, and culminating in the Jesuit's oath of unquestioning Obedience, the work stretches over the great period of the Middle Age. It was a work of continuous action and re-action, of which the motive power was the Imperialism which the Church inherited.

Two minor causes came in aid of this. One cause was the Patrimony of St. Peter. Another was the fact, that Italy was the centre of thought, of art, of culture ; was also the field, upon which contended all the opposed political systems of Europe. It was the most magnificent training-school for the development of Ecclesiastical Statesmanship, which the world ever has seen, or will see. Republicanism, Feudality, Absolute Monarchy, the Commercial City, with its net-work of banded Leagues, the classic traditions, the barbarian precedents,—all met upon the same soil. To ally itself, now with one, now with another of these,—to use all, to depress all, to be bound by none,—was the policy of the Papacy. Its triple crown became the emblem of that three-fold supremacy, which now employed the spiritual attributes of man's loftiest nature, now triumphed in the wisdom of earth, and now, at need, could summon the infernal daring, the unfathomable duplicity of the pit. From this training came the power of the Papacy. Its direct impulse we have already specified. It was the patrimony of St. Peter. This gave the Popedom its ever-present stake in the game of European politics. It held and multiplied its own personal domain, by the tenure of a constantly shifting balance of power, by changing alliances, of which the one purpose was its own interest. Spiritually, it claimed a world-wide dominion,—but its practical aim was the sovereignty of Italy.

Out of these causes, grew the dominant idea of the Papacy, Ultra-Montanism. It rejected the opportunity, as it did the thought, of a true Catholicity, in the desire of a Catholicism fast anchored at the centre in the soil of Italy. The Ecclesiastic, in all lands, became a man without a country, whose home was the Imperial city. This developed that policy, so peculiarly Roman, of detaching the Church's servants entirely from the soil on which they lived and worked ; of making them

wholly dependent upon the central power, while striving to give them a hold upon all possible interests of the land of their sojourn. Every Ecclesiastic became the paid Ambassador, spy, partizan of the Papacy. Not only was he placed above the Law of the land, but was severed from the love of it. To work out this surpassing problem, required consummate genius, and it chanced to be the very one to which only the Italian genius was wholly adequate. Without the temptation of the Papal patrimony, the Popedom would have become a fluid, shifting power, with a centre, now at Paris, now at Madrid, now at Vienna,—then, like the polypus, to be parted into a number of independent and hostile National Churches. All Europe was fighting for the possession of the fair field of Italy, that hapless Bride of the strongest in the Mediæval tournament. It was necessary that the Papacy should be irrevocably Italian, both in interest and in instinct, that it might preserve its life, amid the rude shocks of that conflicting time.

We need not regret this. We cannot but feel that Europe would then have been the loser, in losing that great, mediating, tempering, inspiring power, which the Church, through its Unity and its isolation, undoubtedly was, during the Middle Age. Its crimes were, in the main, confined to Italy; its beneficence was felt through the whole of the European world. All that we claim is, that the false idea of Ultra-Montane Catholicism needed to exist for a season, that from it should be born, in the fulness of time, the true, the Churchly, the Christian Catholicity. We regard the Papacy as the outworn husk and calix of a fairer flower, which needs not, as the eirenic dream of Modern Mediævalists would have us believe, to be closed up again, into the old form of its budding growth, but now should drop off and wither away. Narrow, insular, partial as is the Anglican idea, it is the true one, and, in its half-developed promise, it is that in which the real lover of the Church should study the great and fair future of Christianity. There is, nowhere, such a consummate silliness and imbecility of thought displayed, as in that shibboleth of a petty, but active party in the Church, which cries out, that to hate the Reformation is the sign of a true Catholicity. What

is needed now, is to see that the Papacy has done its work, fulfilled its mission. The yearning for a true Catholic Unity, is a sign that the office of the Popedom, in preserving that idea, in impressing it upon the mind of the Church, is now complete. Its work is ended. It is no longer the sign and cause of Unity; it ought to pass away, before it shall become the parent of hopeless and enduring Schism.

The Book we are reviewing is a valuable evidence, that the right leaven is at work. The Roman Church cannot be effectively attacked from without. Like some of those fortress strong-holds in our late War, which defied, by their natural position, the skill of the engineer and the valor of the soldier, it is girdled by the vast morass of its own pretensions. Its inner defences are insignificant, but they are beyond the range of the heaviest artillery. The movement of surrender must come from within. Blockade is doing its work. Active minds will not be starved within the camp. The attempt to provision the fortress, builds a fatal causeway for the enemy. The effort which the Papacy has made to preserve its Temporal Sovereignty, has compelled it to try recourse to its old weapons, only to have them burst in its hands. Italy, which made the Popes, will yet unmake them. Then will be disclosed that fallacy, which lies in the glowing prophecy of Lord Macaulay, of the enduring nature of the Papal dominion. Having given all its life to the end of being Ultra-Montane, having concentrated into its tap-root of Italian, of Roman Supremacy, its every current of vital nourishment, with the uprooting of that it *must* die. It cannot remove the Chair of Peter to another city than that of his legendary Martyrdom. Rome is the seat of the Papal Rebellion against true Catholicity, and when that is abandoned, surrender is but a question of time.

We take this Book, as we said, for a sign of what we are stating. The Abbé Guettée is not, in the ordinary sense of the term, a convert. He has worked out the question for himself. Investigation, not influence, has led him where he is. The path once trodden, others must follow. Nay, the fact that one has trodden it, shows, that behind him is rising and pushing on, the same tendency. One drop of water oozing

through a dyke, does not alone make a pathway for the ocean, but it betokens that the dyke is weakened, and that the waves are resistlessly surging against it. As he has thought, so others are beginning to think. And though the pioneer force may be but as one man, the following is of that great multitude, whom none can number. True thought can always rest content in its single demonstration ; for, in the first step, is summed up the cost of the whole undertaking.

We have not, for this very reason, cared to examine, in detail, the line of the Abbé's argument. It is valuable, as showing, as we have said, the workings of a mind educated in the fetters of Romanism. It may be useful to indicate the line of successful controversy, to those who have a taste for it. But the success of controversy must depend upon the inherent weakness of the beaten party, upon the will ready to yield, and asking only for the relief of sound argument, to ease its disturbed conscience. We hold that the decisive movement will come, essentially, from within the Church of Rome. The reasonings of the Abbé, clear and convincing as they are, overthrow positions, which, to us, have but slight importance. And, to use a just past illustration, he who ventures far into the marshy quagmire which is Rome's chief defence, can hardly come near enough to perceive the feebleness of her intrenchments, without great peril of losing his retreat to the firm land which he has left. To those in danger of going to Romanism, such arguments come too late ; by those who are not in danger, they are not needed.

Let us not, however, seem to undervalue a book, which we have read with great pleasure, and which we regard as most timely and well-devised. Outside the Church, outside in fact of all direct religious influence, there is a great and growing body of educated and thoughtful minds. Upon these, the Romish Church in this country is building its great, its only hope. Of course such feel the need of a Church, and the yearning for a great and Christian Institution, which shall stand aloof from the dogmas, intrigues, and wrangles of the Sects. Often have we heard this saying :—"I belong to no

Church, and am not likely to join any, but if I do, it will be the Catholic" (Roman) "Church." To such Rome appeals, by all its dexterity of management, its imposing ceremonial, its historic and haughty pretension. To such, we commend this Book ; or, rather, we commend to all who are interested in such minds, (and who does not number many among his friends !) this Book to be placed in their hands. It will be a healthy prophylactic against the seductions of Romanism. It cannot be read attentively, without leading the thought toward the truer basis of the Catholic Church, which is both Catholic and Orthodox ; Orthodox in its Faith, Catholic in its Form.

Too much of the argument, popularly levelled against Rome, has been founded upon premises which, if sound, would destroy the idea of a Church ; and this has been the cause of their failure. For this it is which gives to Romanism that spell, which, in spite of all its corruptions, it has not wholly lost. In what we have said of Catholicity, we have been referring only to that mistaken idea of it, which the Papacy embodies,—that which we have called Catholicism,—the idea of Catholicity divorced from, and superior to, Orthodoxy. We reject it as a test of Orthodoxy, which shall be superior to the testimony of the past, to Holy Scripture, and to the Decrees of fairly convened Councils. We reject it as an end, to which it shall be lawful to sacrifice truth, piety, and righteousness. We desire it as the means to an end ; we regard its visible severance as the great hindrance to the Church's work.

But that stumbling-block, of the loss of Unity, can be taken away, only through One power, that for which we are taught continually to pray,—“the operation of the Holy Spirit, that all who profess, and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the Faith in unity of Spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.” To that, all true eirenic measures will tend ; acknowledgment of error, where we have erred ; fidelity to those things wherein we stand ; Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order ; toleration of what is Form, sincerity in what is of substance.

Guided by these principles, our conclusion is one which this remarkable Book has strengthened and enlightened ; that, with the Church in the West, as with the Church in the East of Europe, we may hope for re-union ;—with the Papacy, Never. That assumption, whether modified or unlimited, whether in the shape of an indefinite Primacy, or in its present form of an Infallible Headship, is wholly Uncatholic, is the pregnant cause of Error, is the one power, which is ever antagonistic to the true ideal of the Church which CHRIST and His Apostles founded, and to the Religion which they revealed.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

ANTE-NICENE LIBRARY: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers, down to A. D., 325. Edited by the Rev. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D. D., and JAMES DONALDSON, LL. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. 1867.

VOL. III. The Writings of Tatian and Theophilus, and the Clementine Recognitions. Translated by Rev. B. P. PRATTEN, Rev. MARCUS DODS, A. M., and Rev. THOMAS SMITH, D. D. 8vo, pp. 485.

VOL. IV. The Writings of Clement of Alexandria. Translated by Rev. WILLIAM WILSON, M. A. Musselburgh: 8vo., pp. 470.

These two additional volumes of the Ante-Nicene Library, confirm all that we said of the series in our last Number. The first volume above named contains, 1st, Tatian's "Address to the Greeks," which the introductory notice describes as "a most unsparing and direct exposure of the enormities of Heathenism." His other and more important work, the *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, has been lost. His Gnostic heresies make this loss the less to be regretted, and yet the fact that he wrote such a work so early as the middle of the second century, or only about fifty years after the death of St. John, is quite enough to upset the stupid cavillings of such men as Renan about the origin of the Four Gospels. This volume also contains, 2d, the treatise of Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, written to his friend Autolycus, in defense of Christianity. Theophilus was a voluminous author, but this Treatise in three books is all that remains of him. His argument is conducted much in the same style as that of Justin Martyr; the treatise is of great interest, and his official position in a Church where the disciples were first called Christians, is indisputable. The volume contains also, 3d, "The Recognitions of Clement," a sort of philosophical and theological Allegory, a work of great popularity in its day, and with more hidden depths of meaning in it than is apparent to our superficial school of "modern thinkers," as they style themselves. A German author, Hilgenfeld, says; "There is scarcely a single writing which is of so great importance for the history of Christianity in its first stage, and which has already given such brilliant disclosures at the hands of the most renowned critics, in regard to the earliest history of the Christian Church, as the writings ascribed to the Roman Clement, 'the Recognitions and Homilies.'"

The second volume above named commences the works of Clement of Alexandria, and contains, the "Exhortation to the Heathen," "The Instructor," and the "Miscellanies, or Stromata." Clement of Alexandria, originally a pagan Philosopher, and familiar with the Platonic and other systems of Philosophy, was one of the most learned men of his age. Several of his works, as his Treatises on Easter, on the Unity and Excellence of the Church, on the Offices of Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons and Widows, are lost; fortunately, several of his most valuable works have been preserved. Copies of these may be found in many of our private libraries, in the original Greek; this accurate and excellent translation brings them within the reach of all intelligent and enquiring Christians. Indeed it is one of the bright signs of the times, and ominous of good in several respects, that Ante-Nicene Christianity is to be so generally understood by the great mass of believers. Neither Romanists, nor Sectarian Controversialists, of the other extreme, will dare repeat what they have so long been in the habit of saying. The Introductory Notice in this volume, alluding to Clement's great and varied erudition, says it was "so multifarious that the works could only have been composed near an extensive library—hardly anywhere but in the vicinity of the famous library of Alexandria. They are a store-house of curious ancient lore—a museum of the fossil remains of

the beauties and monstrosities of the world of pagan antiquity." It adds: "Of course there is throughout plenty of false science and frivolous and fanciful speculation."

Both volumes are furnished with full Indexes, which add much to their practical value.

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES—Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical—by JOHN P. LANGE, D. D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, and edited with additions, original and selected, by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., in connection with American Divines of various Evangelical Denominations.

VOL. IV., of the New Testament, containing the Epistles General of James, Peter, John and Jude. Translated from the German Revised Editions, with additions original and selected. By J. ISADOR MOMBERT, D. D., Rector of St. James Church, Lancaster, Penn. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. 8vo.

The Rev. Dr. Mombert, a Church clergyman, has translated the Commentary on the Catholic Epistles, and has spent more than three years of labor upon it. Notwithstanding the extreme difficulty of translating these modern German writers, especially with their fondness for and facility in word-coining, Dr. Mombert has succeeded in rendering his authors into clear, vigorous English. He has not hesitated to express his dissent from the teaching of the Commentators, in great numbers of instances, and his additions are very valuable. We have previously given our own estimate of this important work. In the matter of textual criticism, it is well nigh exhaustive; and the homiletical and practical portions are always suggestive. Its great defect is, that, although the writers are among the more orthodox of the modern German school, they think and speculate always under the influence of the Rationalistic Philosophy, even when they avoid its impious presumptions and conclusions. They make little or no account of what may be termed the Catholic interpretation. In not a few passages, Dr. Mombert has thrown new light upon the Commentary on the Catholic Epistles by his references to the times in which they were written, to the Church as it was then already established, and to the Faith as it was already clearly held and taught. This is a sound principle of reasoning, and in all other kinds of composition it is universally recognized. And yet, not a few of our modern exegetes pretend to know better than even the inspired Apostles themselves what the HOLY GHOST taught them to believe and to do; or, as one of them has it, "Paul, I know, says so and so, but I think differently." Yet this man is thoroughly consistent with himself, and with the school to which he belongs. As we have said before, the authors of this German Commentary are not to be classed with such men as Strauss; on the contrary, they are doing great good in exposing the sophistry and shallowness of the infidel and destructive school which, a few years ago, was so bold and impudent, and they are meeting them, too, on their own chosen ground.

CHRISTIANITY AND ITS CONFLICTS, ANCIENT AND MODERN. By E. E. MARCY, A. M. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 480.

We know nothing of the history of this book, or of the influences which led to its preparation. It had a history evidently. Such a remarkable production never came into the world without special causes. We should suppose, that the author was born and bred a staunch Calvinist; that he was taught in the nursery that "Hell is paved with the skulls of infants not a span long—all to the glory of God's infinite justice;" that some shrewd Romish Casuist, or some casuistical book, at a particular crisis in his religious history, grasped at like a straw by the drowning man, placed before him the claims of what calls itself "the Catholic Church;" and that, tired of unrest, sick even to loathing of the vagaries of Human Reason and Private Judgment, he surrendered himself, without examination, body and soul, intellect and heart, to the baseless pretensions of a new master, and that master, the Church of Rome. And so, he was induced to write a book, to show

how Christianity fought and triumphed in the "conflicts" of the early days, and how Christianity, or rather the Roman Church, will conquer in the "conflicts" of our own times. The work is written, to a large extent, outside of facts; it is the production of a theorist or dreamer, who first lays down his own propositions, and then hunts after authorities to sustain them. We need not notice his caricatures of the Continental Reformers, as Martin Luther and John Calvin, or his statement of the results of the Continental Reformation as respects Doctrine, Morals, and Civilization. All that we care to do is to call attention to the profound ignorance of the author as to what Christianity really is, to his reckless and unqualified misstatements of historic facts, and to his second-hand clap-trap in the way of quotations from popular writers. For example, he says: "St. Clement, St. Polycarp, and St. Ignatius, were pupils of the Apostles, had often conversed with them, and heard them preach. These men recognized the Roman Catholic Church as the only Church of God, the Supremacy of the Roman Bishop," &c. &c. And among those, by whom he says "these truths were transmitted from generation to generation for so many centuries," he names Saints Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Cyril, Hilary, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, Vincent, and a host of holy fathers." p. 161. Our readers will say that this is quite enough. But here is something else in the same strain. "During his life time, St. Peter, as Head Bishop of the Church, ordained his subordinate bishops, priests and deacons, sent them to the different nations as ministers, gave them instructions and advice as to their Missions, received their reports, and was regarded by all the disciples as the authorized and Supreme Head and representative of our Lord Jesus Christ on earth." p. 205. Again, "the licentious propensities of a bold and unscrupulous king, in denying the papal supremacy, and in constituting himself supreme spiritual as well as temporal head of his dominions, originated the Church of England." * * * In all things, Cranmer pandered to the passions and prejudices of Henry, while hypocritically plotting against the ancient Church." p. 315.

Of course a writer, capable of inditing such stuff as this, is not a man to be reasoned with, and little more need be said of him or his book. And yet the volume is full of such perversions of the plainest facts of history. His representations of the results of Romish missions are in the same vein. We have a right to be amazed, that the present appalling condition of the Papal Religion in Italy, in Central and South America, and in nearly every country where it has been thoroughly tried, did not prevent the rhapsody of the writer as to the prospects of Romanism; but we need not henceforth be surprised at any possible amount or degree of ignorance, which we may meet on the whole subject of the Church, not only among Romanists, but among those with whom this writer must have had his education. It is an unfortunate book in every respect. Even the better informed Romanists will laugh at it. We commend to Mr. Marcy the late work of the Abbé Guetteé on "The Papacy." The Abbé is master of the subject, and if Mr. Marcy will read his book impartially, he will never again dare put forth such a mass of distorted statements.

LIBER LIBERORUM: Its Structure, Limitations and Purpose. A friendly Communication with a reluctant Skeptic. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 232.

This volume purports to have been written as a sequel to a correspondence between a reluctant skeptic and the author, which correspondence is given as an Introduction to the volume. Both writers are anonymous. Perhaps the whole correspondence is a sort of by-play, written by the author himself to prepare the way for his peculiar method and style of argument. Most certainly the Skeptic is not so very "reluctant"; and the author asks a little too much, when he challenges our sympathies for one whom he represents as a poor honest-minded creature, who would really like to believe the Bible if he only could, but who has been absolutely driven into skepticism by his own unsophisticated love of truth, and the intrinsic difficulties of Revelation. For this personification of weakness can flout with the blasphemies of Strauss and F. W. Newman, and Colenso, with whose writings he is evidently familiar, and the whole tone of his letter is in their vein. The author

of the Preface to the American edition, who also conceals his name, endorses the book strongly, not unqualifiedly, for he has sagacity enough to perceive that there are things in it which will shock the sensibilities of American Christians. For example, this book makes "the verifying faculty" to be "Reason enlightened and sanctified by the Holy Spirit." The doctrine of Eternal Punishment has, the author says, "no place in the Word of God;" on the Trinity "much has been said and written which can find no sanction in the Bible;" on the language of the Nicene Creed his comment is, "fools rush in where angels fear to tread," a proposition, which we certainly will not dispute with him. The miracles of Elisha he doubts, and calls them "stories;" the incidents in the Old Testament history, connected with the Midianites, Abraham and Isaac, Jael, Rahab, Ehud and Samson, the passage of the Red Sea, and the Sun standing still, if they do not lack reality in the light of "the verifying faculty," at any rate our author accepts them according to the interpretation of Dean Stanley! We should do the author of *Liber Librorum* great injustice, if we were to affirm that he denies either Miracles or Inspiration. He does not do either, but insists on both. His defect is, that he relies too exclusively on subjective testimony, and rejects that which is objective. He forgets that the Church is "the pillar and ground of the Truth." He is not mistaken in supposing that many, indeed most of "the difficulties" of Revelation have arisen as the result of human systems of theology, and, in so far as he shall make this apparent, his work will do good: but he has erected a tribunal which can never solve the Mysteries of Revelation, and we do not deny that there are such mysteries; a tribunal which, in our days, is only another name for Human Pride and Self-Will. The latter portions of this volume are evidently very hastily written, and in the two chapters, one on "The Modern Pharisee," which is aimed at Mr. Burgon, and the other a Postscript, he has stumbled upon difficulties of a totally opposite character, but which he utterly fails to meet. The following passage from one of his Notes in the Appendix, shows the *status*, or the want of *status* of the author; and our readers can judge for themselves how much this *Liber Librorum* is likely to avail with a "reluctant skeptic." "England swarms with Dissenters, only because the Church of England has never allowed any safety-valve for Christian zeal or individual convictions. She may yet make herself the Church of the nation, if she will, but it must be by separating herself, as an establishment, alike from the Episcopal, and from every other Church."

FAREWELL COUNSEL OF A PASTOR TO HIS FLOCK. Nine Sermons preached at St. John's, Paddington, before quitting that sphere of Ministerial Labor. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D. D., Dean of Norwich. Rivingtons, Waterloo Place, London. Oxford: Cambridge, 1867. New York: Pott & Amery. 12mo., pp. 193.

No modern popular writer is doing more to graft in the hearts of the faithful a true, living, loving reception of the most vital truths and principles of the Christian Faith, than Dean Goulburn. The secret of his power is, in that while he shows a scholarly appreciation of the tendencies, the unbelief, and the infidelity of the times, he accepts the Gospel as the Church presents it, as a reality; not to be cavilled at, not to be reasoned about, but to be believed and obeyed. He rarely writes or preaches as a controversialist. Believing Christ's promises to be what they purport to be, he every where addresses the heart and conscience of the believer, and pleads for a simple, child-like, trusting faith. This is what the Church needs. This is what every individual soul needs. The Sermons in this volume are the author's parting words to his Paddington flock, and are upon those points on which there is every where, just now, special need of great caution and faithfulness. The subjects of the Sermons are, Absolution; Ritualism; the Eucharist; the Atonement; the Stability of the Orthodox Faith, and of Personal Religion; the Preaching of Christ Crucified; the Responsibility of Hearers. We recommend this volume, and indeed all the Dean's works, to our readers for their private reading.

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York;

author of a "Treatise on Human Physiology," "A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. I. Containing the causes of the War, and the events preparatory to it, up to the close of President Buchanan's Administration. New York: Harper & Bros., Publishers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 567.

We are beginning to have histories of the late Civil War, which are not content with the mere details of the struggle, but which discuss the subject on broader grounds. What were the real causes of that War? What were the ends sought to be accomplished by it? What will be its final result? The first of these three questions, Professor Draper seeks to answer. He says that the origin of the War "dates before any of those who have been the chief actors in it were born." He finds the origin of it in physical causes mainly, in climate, and in those industrial habits and social institutions and regulations which grow out of climatic influences, productions, &c. His main position, and it is the key to his philosophy, is thus stated: "In the same manner that climate affects plants, it likewise affects human beings, producing modified men. It controls their complexions, their bodily construction, their duration of life, their actions, their thoughts. It has given rise in the Atlantic region to two distinctly marked populations, and in the Pacific region will hereafter originate many others, the counterparts of nations now occurring in Asia." And so the Professor presents us with a diagram, with the isothermal lines drawn out, which are to determine the "actions" and "thoughts" of men. This is really a very convenient method of solving some very important social problems, though it does not happen to be an original one with Professor Draper, nor indeed with Mr. Buckle either, from whom he evidently borrowed it. Starting with this *petitio principii*, he discusses the following as the main points of his volume. "Physical characteristics of North America; the topography and meteorology of the republic; the character of the colonial and subsequent population; the tendency to antagonism impressed upon that population by climate and other causes; the gradual development of two geographical parties, the North and the South; their struggles for supremacy in the Union, and the rupture between them."

Having shown, in a previous volume, how utterly unphilosophical, how false to facts and to human experience, this materialistic theory is, we have no occasion to discuss it now. The volume will at least do good in one respect. It will help put an end to such stupid nonsense and self-conceit, as a certain class of men are now putting forth for the glorification of themselves and the sects to which they belong. Thus, one of them lately said: "We of the United States received from you, with the Pilgrim Fathers, a boon which can never be too highly prized, that of institutional liberty." * * * "The Puritan brought the family and the Church, as we understand them, and with them liberty and loyalty were incorporated in our commonwealth from the first." * * * "Parallel with this, came another doctrine—that men of a certain race and color might be held and treated as chattels. That became planted in our country, more especially in the South; and these two systems—manhood on the one hand, and chattelism on the other—one based on the recognition of man, and another on the degradation of man—developed side by side until the final issue came in the conflict through which we have just now passed."

The terrible struggle, through which the nation has passed, was brought on by antagonisms of various kinds. Professor Draper has one theory. The Puritan, whom we have just quoted, has another, Horace Greeley has another, Mr. E. A. Pollard, of Richmond, has another. There is a fragment of truth in each of them, but they all write astride of their own individual hobby. Their histories are worth reading, even now, and they will be invaluable to the future historian of that great national convulsion. Professor Draper writes with more boldness and with more freedom from the shackles of sectional cant, than any Northern writer who has yet taken hold of the subject. We think we may promise a review of his work when the other two volumes are published.

We have not attempted a review of this work of Prof. Draper, his "History of the American Civil War." It is false in its Philosophy, and false in its facts. The Professor is an excellent Chemist. We advise him to let the writing of History, and especially the philosophy of History, alone. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD; Essays on Questions of the Day in 1866, by Various Writers; edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M. A. Third Edition. 1867. 8vo., pp. 570.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD; Essays on Questions of the Day in 1867, by Various Writers, edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M. A. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer. 1867. 8vo., pp. 567. New York: Pott & Amery.

In the first Article in the present Number, we have called attention to the First Series of these Papers, on the Church and the World. In them are discussed some of the most important questions of the day. These are treated with a boldness which will startle the timid, and frighten the time-serving. They are written by men, who see clearly the utter wreck and ruin which threaten to engulf modern Protestantism, and who profess, honestly we doubt not, to be defining and setting forth foundations which are as old, and immutable, and comprehensive, as the Catholic Faith and Catholic Church, Church Organization, Church Doctrine, Church Discipline, Church Ritual, Church Life, Church Work. These, and such as these, are the topics, which are handled earnestly and fearlessly by men who appreciate the Erastianism and the Rationalism, which now threaten the life, if not the very existence of the English Church. The Second Series are by new writers, none of whom appear in the first. The Essays are written independently of each other, and differ greatly in value, even in the standpoint of the several authors. Some of them are thoroughly Mediæval in tone and temper, and are as utterly uncatholic and rationalistic as are the Errors which they assail. In this respect they are treacherous, not only to the reformed Church of England, but to the Catholic principles, on which that reformation was effected. Take, for example, the Paper on the Three Vows, viz., The Vow of Poverty, The Vow of Chastity [or rather Celibacy], and the Vow of Obedience. The whole tone of the Paper breathes of a Mediæval system, and that system was the fruit of an old Pagan Philosophy. Several of the papers, however, are of a different stamp, and are noble and masterly vindications of great truths, and written in a manner suited to our own country and times. The volumes are sold by Messrs Pott & Amery at about \$7.00 each. They should be read carefully, but not blindly. The questions so boldly treated are such as must and will be met; no possible amount of noisy clamor will prevent it.

In the Second Series, the Papers are, (1.) "Some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833, by W. J. E. Bennett, M. A.; (2.) Preachers and Preaching, by Rev. A. B. Evans, D. D.; (3.) The Sacrament of Marriage, by John Walter Lea; (4.) Public Law and the Colonial Church, by the Rev. Edmund Huff, M. A.; (5.) On Greek Rites in the West, by the Bishop of Brechin; (6.) Sisterhood Life; (7.) Private Confession and Absolution, by the Rev. J. C. Chambers, M. A.; (8.) Religious Toleration, by Rev. M. J. Blacker, M. A.; (9.) Church Music, by J. W. Rumsey; (10.) The Curate Question, by Arthur Baker, M. A.; (11.) A Layman's View of Confession, by J. D. Chambers, M. A.; (12.) On the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical, by a Magistrate; (13.) The Ritual Law of the Church of England, by the Hon. Colin Lindsay; (14.) Latitudinarianism, by Rev. J. Oldknow, D. D.; (15.) The Three Vows, by Rev. W. Humphrey; (16.) On the Symbolism of Ritual, by Rev. C. J. Le Geyt, M. A."

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN THE INSPIRATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. By T. F. CURTIS, D. D., Late Professor in the University at Lewisburg, Pa. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 386.

This Dr. Curtis is, we suppose, of the Baptist persuasion. He is evidently not learned in Physical Science, and he shirks the real difficulties of the subject he pretends to discuss, and on which he yet avows the most positive opinions. Formerly a believer in, and a teacher of, "Plenary Inspiration," he confesses having "entered into Neander's views." In this volume he pretends to give a statement of the modern theories on Inspiration, and includes a sort of *resumé* of the latest utterances of modern Infidelity on that subject. He endorses the superficialities of Colenso, and refers to Ewald and De Wette as authorities. He runs a tilt at

Hugh Miller on Geology, whom he evidently does not understand. He thinks the race of man have lived on the Earth "more probably six or seven hundred thousand years." He says the Inspiration of the Scriptures is "higher in degree, though not different in kind," from the "mere inspiration of genius." He denies "every part of the New Testament to have been so dictated by an unerring Spirit as to be infallible in itself." As to the Old Testament, he says the account of the Creation "cannot be regarded as a literal and infallible record of the facts of the case," and that the narrator of the Deluge, although mistaken, "reported the history as he had received it from his ancestors." The book as a whole is a compilation, at second hand, of the quibbles and cavils of modern skeptics, who, on being rejected and silenced, as they have been again and again, fly from one subterfuge to another; showing clearly enough that their infidelity is of the heart rather than of the head. The title of the book, *The Human Element in Inspiration*, represents a great truth, which has been too much lost sight of; but what that truth is the author has not told us, nor is he likely to do so, under the guidance of the teachers whom he has chosen. The book is really of no value and of very little account. An out and out antagonist, like Strauss, or Renan, gives us at least a fair contest. Yet Strauss's theory is now abandoned; and Renan, if not routed and driven from the field, has become perfectly harmless. The author's preface is dated at or near Boston, and the work is a feeble expression of one phase of that miserable Philosophy, which has obtained such sway in that portion of the country. New England Unbelief is the natural fruit of a metaphysical system of Divinity, which is now dead; the way is prepared, or preparing, for the conception of a Faith which, as among the Corinthians of old, does "not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

RURAL STUDIES; With Hints for Country Places. By the author of "*My Farm of Edgewood*," &c. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867. 12mo.. pp. 295.

There are two classes of persons, to whom this work, by "Ik Marvel," or Mr. Donald G. Mitchell, may be commended. One class comprises those city gentlemen who become suddenly smitten with a fancy for a rural residence, and who attempt to realize their dream. Such a man, after having spent no inconsiderable sum upon his *Arcadia*, (for such experiments are not made without money,) at length grows weary of his plan; he begins to suspect that his tastes and habits belong to the city and not to the country; he is glad to sell his country place at a sacrifice, and he goes back to his city home in disgust. We have a striking illustration of this not far from the place where we are now writing. The other class who should read Mr. Mitchell's book, includes practical farmers in the country. Such persons may, in this volume, learn to surround themselves, gradually and at little cost, with those thousand little elegancies and embellishments which would help to convert their laborious avocation into a source, not only of pecuniary profit, but of perpetual pleasure and improvement. The effect of the book will be to elevate and ennoble this profession. The farmer need not necessarily be the coarse boor and plough-jogger. His hand may be hard, and his face brown, but he may be, and he ought to be, at heart and in reality, a true gentleman. The charm of Mr. Mitchell's book is in the vein of strong good sense, of manly feeling and cultivated taste which runs through it. Himself a practical farmer, as well as a man of intellectual and aesthetic culture, he has prepared a series of papers full of useful hints and suggestions on almost every possible topic of landscape gardening and agricultural life. He has also furnished several architectural sketches of rural residences, cuts of gateways, etc., and given plans of plots of ground laid out with artistic skill and beauty. Mr. Mitchell, in the production of this and his other volumes, which we are glad to see are becoming popular, is proving himself a public benefactor; and, if no monument shall be erected to his memory, he will be sure to live in the higher grade of civilization which he is doing so much to foster. His work will help to correct that false pride, and that ruinous delusion, which are driving so many of our young men from the country into the cities and large towns. In ninety-nine cases in a hundred they do not gain either in respectability or virtue; too often they lose both.

BENCH AND BAR. A Complete Digest of the Wit, Humor, Asperities and Amenities of the Law. By J. L. Bigelow, Counsellor-at-Law. With Portraits and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 12mo., pp. 364.

Mr. Bigelow has collected, with much labor and no inconsiderable amount of reading, illustrative Anecdotes of the Lord Chancellors of England, of celebrated British Barristers, of the Chief Justices of the United States, and of the Western Bar, and a large lot of Miscellaneous Legal Epigrams, Puns and Poems. For many reasons the Legal profession has always been prolific in sharp wit, biting sarcasm, and brilliant repartee, and thousands of these *bon mots* are floating in our current literature. They are often so characteristic of their authors as to have a biographical, and even a historical value. Mr. Bigelow has done his work cleverly, in collecting and arranging the very best of these anecdotes, under their appropriate heads. There are, in this volume, thirty-two Illustrations, and the work is dedicated to the Hon. Roscoe Conkling.

AN ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON AMERICAN GRAPE CULTURE AND WINE-MAKING. By PETER B. MEAD. Profusely Illustrated. 8vo., cloth, \$3. Harper & Brothers, New York. 1867. pp. 483.

The author of this work shows a thorough familiarity with his subject; he is not a mere theorizer, but a practical grape-grower of long experience, and the treatise has been prepared at the urgent request of many friends. It enters into all the details of the culture of grapes, and the author's observations on the various varieties of grapes, and the climates best adapted to them, are very useful. It must be a standard work on a subject which is becoming one of great and increasing importance.

THE DIVINE REST: or Scriptural Views of the Sabbath. By JOHN S. STONE, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1867. 12mo., pp. 204.

There are several points, on which this question of the Sabbath needs to be thoroughly examined. It is indeed one of the great questions of our day, What is the nature of the Christian Sabbath? Rather, have we any Christian Sabbath at all? If we have, what is the ground of its obligation? On what authority was the Sabbath transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week? Dr. Stone discusses several of these question somewhat cursorily, but in the main satisfactorily. He maintains the institution of the Day at the Creation of the World, though he does not give the argument in full; and also the moral character and significance of its right observance. In this respect, the old Puritans ran to one extreme, the ultra party in the Church to the other extreme. As to the change of the Day from the seventh day to the first, Dr. Stone is less conclusive in his statements; indeed he cannot, on his argument, prove the *divine authority* of the change, without proving the divine authority and binding and perpetual obligation of some other things, about which he is at least less positive. In a word, the Institutions of Christianity all rest upon one foundation. They all stand, or all fall together. Honest Churchmen and honest Anti-Churchmen must admit this; and some of them do admit it. The whole question of the Christian Sabbath must be taken up by the Pulpit and the Press. The profanation of the day is one of the most alarming signs of the times.

PLAIN SERMONS ON PERSONAL RELIGION. By the Rev. GEORGE W. NATT, Late Rector of St. Andrew's Church, West Philadelphia. Philadelphia: J. B. Lip-pincott & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 408.

The Rev. Mr. Natt died Feb. 4, 1863. They who knew him best, will, in their recollections of him, recall, first of all, the purity, sincerity, unselfishness, and gentleness of his character, the maturity of his learning, and the depth of his devotion to the cause of Christ and the Church. His Sermons were prepared with so much care, and there was in them such brevity and scholarly taste, and yet such

directness of appeal to the heart and conscience, that the late Rt. Rev. Bishop A. Potter advised the publication of a selection from them, for lay-reading and for general distribution. Mr. Natt wrote nearly two thousand sermons, in his comparatively brief ministry. His great theme was CHRIST AND THE CHURCH. He did not know how to separate them. Yet he was eminently practical, and his appeals to the conscience were most direct and impressive. The Volume contains thirty Sermons, and a well-written Memoir. No one can study such a character, can read these Sermons, and follow him down to the close of his life, and say that Christianity is not a glorious reality.

THE EARLY YEARS OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE CONSORT. Compiled under the direction of Her Majesty the Queen. By Lieut. General the Hon. C. GREY. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 12mo., pp. 371.

We confess that on the announcement of this work, we doubted whether its publication was in good taste. There is a sacredness in the deep, holy affection of home and of domestic life; there is a delicacy in the approaches and the endearments of such love, which involuntarily shrinks from the public gaze. We do not doubt that this marriage was a love match, and that the grief of the Queen over the loss of her husband is sincere; and it appears by a letter from the editor, General Grey, to the Queen, that the volume was at first designed for private circulation only. He says: "As I believe your Majesty intends to limit the circulation of this volume to your Majesty's own children and family, or, if it goes beyond them, to a very small circle of personal friends, I have not thought it necessary to omit any of the very interesting and private details contained in your Majesty's memoranda, or to withhold the touching expressions of your Majesty's feelings as given in your Majesty's own words. Some of these details, particularly those relating to your Majesty's marriage, it might seem unusual to include in a work intended for more general perusal, though, even in that case, judging of others' feelings by my own, I cannot doubt that they would meet with the warmest and most heartfelt sympathy." The interest in the work, however, was so general, that the Queen yielded to the advice of her friends and consented to its publication. Its effect upon the public will be to elevate the standard of manners and morals, and to strengthen attachment to her Majesty. It certainly is an interesting volume; the Prince was undoubtedly a noble character, and he had already begun to exercise a leading influence, not only in Great Britain, but in the European courts; and yet it was an influence which he earned for himself in the face of prejudice and jealousy. The English edition we see is advertised at about \$4.00 in gold. The Messrs. Harper sell theirs at \$2.00. It is neatly published, and contains two portraits of the Prince, one at the age of four, and one at twenty years. Other volumes are to follow.

HOME LIFE: A Journal. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL, Author of "Laneton Parsonage," &c., &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 405.

This tale was written with the wish to illustrate not only a few fundamental principles of education, but also the difficulties and disappointments attendant upon the endeavor to carry them out under ordinary circumstances, and among ordinary people.

THE DOMESTIC ALTAR: A Manual of Family Prayers for the Ecclesiastical Year, with Prayers and Thanksgivings for Special Occasions. By the Rev. HARRY CROSWELL, D. D. Fifth Edition. New York: H. B. Durand. 1867. 16mo., pp. 261.

The distinct recognition of the Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year, and the Scriptural and Churchly language and spirit of the Prayers, in this work by the late Rev. Dr. Croswell, will make it acceptable to sober and devout Churchmen. It has already reached its fifth edition.

"THE LAND OF THOR." By J. ROSS BROWNE, author of "Yusef," "Crusoe's Island," "An American Family in Germany," etc. Illustrated by the Author. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 12mo., pp. 542.

For a man, to dash into a subject *in medias res*, and, in a rollicking way tell the queerest stories on the queerest of subjects, and for noticing droll peculiarities, even among the most hum-drum sort of people; for a man, to provoke laughter over his odd conceits, and at the same time to win respect for the vein of good sense which runs through his story—for such a man, we commend our readers to Ross Browne. In his "Land of Thor" he describes scenes, social life, men, and manners, &c., in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Revel, Helsingfors, Abo, Stockholm, Christiana, Lillehammer, down the Drivsdal and in Iceland. The Illustrations, of which there are a hundred or more, are as amusing as the narrative, and the book will prove a source of amusement and information.

THE CULTURE DEMANDED BY MODERN LIFE. A Series of Addresses and Arguments on the Claims of Scientific Education. By Professors Tyndall, Henfrey, Huxley, Paget, Whewell, Faraday, Liebig, Draper, DeMorgan, Drs. Barnard, Hodgson, Carpenter, Hooker, Acland, Forbes, Herbert Spencer, Sir John Herschel, Sir Charles Lyell, Dr. Seguin, Mr. Mill, etc. With an Introduction on Mental Education in Education, by E. L. YOUNMANS. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 473.

The object of Prof. Youmans in preparing this volume, is to advocate the study of Physical Science in our Colleges, instead of giving such chief prominence to the Ancient Classics and Mathematics. Besides his own contributions to the volume, he has collected a series of Essays and Lectures, by German, English and American scholars, written independently of each other, yet all in defense of the same general ideas. It is but just, however, to President Barnard of Columbia College, one of the contributors, to say, that in a Note he protests against the notion that classical learning should lose the pre-eminent place which it has hitherto held in the course of College study. Now, on this whole subject, without entering into its merits, there are several things to be observed in the outset. 1. There is a fixed determination abroad, and a very strong tendency in some quarters, to throw aside the Classics, or to give them an inferior place, in a course of liberal study. 2. This new movement is, to a large extent, instigated, or fostered, by the teachers of what is called the Positive Philosophy; and whose domain is not to be limited to the realm of Physics, but which claims also, as its own, the world of Psychology, Sociology, Ethics and Religion. Thus Prof. Youmans says: "Physiology passes insensibly into psychology, the central science, upon which hinge logic, sociology, political economy, history, ethics, æsthetics, and literature. * * * Ethics, or moral science, determines the principles which should guide the right ruling of conduct, and depends upon every science which can throw light on the progress of the intellect, the evolution of the emotions, and the limits of moral liberty and responsibility imposed by the conditions of physical organizations or social circumstances." This, though not so strongly put as is done by Herbert Spencer, is yet plain enough. 3. These men are, in our judgment, entirely mistaken as to the object and comparative value and importance of the Ancient Classics and Mathematics in a course of study. Whether the object be mental discipline, or intellectual acumen, or the harmonious development of all the powers, or severe taste, or profound knowledge on the most important subjects of human learning, the loss in laying aside the Classics and Mathematics for Physical Science under any circumstances, and especially in its present inchoate state, would be incalculable and irremediable. 4. Physical Science owes its existence and discoveries mostly to the labors of men trained under the old *regime*. To lay aside this would be like "killing the goose that laid the golden egg," and would be sure to end in inaugurating a reign of quacks and quackery in every department of social life. 5. We are not to be classed among those who oppose the study of what is called *ologies*. That man who pretends to be a teacher at the present day, be he clergyman or layman, makes a terrible mistake, who ignores Physical Science. It is a

source of real knowledge, and so, legitimately deserving of his attention; and, besides, certain claims are based upon it, of which the Christian teacher cannot afford to be ignorant, especially in times like these.

With these general observations, we are happy to note the masterly ability, and the generally unexceptional tone of the papers which Prof. Youmans has here brought together in convenient form. Some valuable extracts from several writers will also be found in the Appendix.

THACKERAY'S LECTURES. *The English Humorists. The Four Georges.* Complete in one volume. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 12mo., pp. 449.

These Lectures on the English Humorists appeared in a separate volume, published by the Messrs. Harper, in 1853, and *The Four Georges*, in 1860. Both series are now comprised in one neat well-printed volume. As for the "Humorists," no other age could have created them. They were the growth of the re-act-
tion of public sentiment against the over-strained austerity of Puritanism, and, with some of them, one extreme led to another. Thackeray has sentiment and genius enough to sketch his portraits lovingly and pleasantly. To criticize the truthfulness of his pictures would take too much of our space. As to what he says of Swift, that strange paradoxical creature, we utter no protest. Addison and Goldsmith are genially described. Pope deserves bolder censure in this Christian country. The Lectures on the Four Georges are crammed full of the bitterest satire; they fairly bristle with scorn and sarcasm, as they show up the life and manners of these Hanoverian Kings and their favorites to public contempt. As Americans, and especially as American Churchmen, we of course can have no great amount of sympathy for these royal sinners, little as we admire the taste which revels in painting to the life such social meanness and corruption. The picture of George III. is relieved of his grosser deformities; still it is as unlovely as it can be.

ISTHMUS OF PANAMA. *History of the Panama Railroad; and of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.* Together with a Traveller's Guide and Business Man's Hand-book for the Panama Railroad, and the Lines of Steamships connecting it with Europe, the United States, the North and South Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, China, Australia, and Japan, by Sail and Steam. By F. N. OTIS, M.D. Numerous illustrations by the Author. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 12mo., pp. 317.

The above title-page is a full description of the contents of the volume. The vast commercial value and international importance of this great avenue across the Isthmus of Panama, can hardly be appreciated without an examination of the tabular statistics which are here brought together. The volume is withal an excellent Guide-Book, and the intelligent traveller in that direction will find in it much geographical and historical information.

COLLEGE LIFE; Its Theory and Practice. By Rev. STEPHEN OLIN, D.D., LL.D., late President of the Wesleyan University. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 12mo., pp. 239.

Dr. Olin, the late President of the Methodist College at Middletown, Conn., held a high rank in that denomination as an educator, and these Lectures, seven in number, and the Baccalaureate Discourses, four in number, were among his most mature productions, and were delivered during the later years of his life. They were designed to cover the whole subject of mental and moral culture, and treat minutely upon the habits of students not only in College but after they have left it. The Lectures and Discourses are thoroughly denominational in their tone, but are worth reading.

WORKS OF CHARLES DICKENS. Globe Edition. Illustrated from Designs by Dar-
ley & Gilbert. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

- (1.) **OLD CURIOSITY SHOP. SKETCHES: Part I.** Four volumes in one.
- (2.) **BARNABY RUDGE. SKETCHES: Part II.** Four volumes in one.

- (3.) MARTIN CHUZZLEWIT. Four volumes in one.
 (4.) DOMBEY & SON. Four volumes in one.
 (5.) OLIVER TWIST. GREAT EXPECTATIONS. Four volumes in one.

The excellence of this Globe edition of Dickens' Works is in the clearness and distinctness of its type. Old eyes and weak eyes can read it without fatigue, and young eyes can read it without injury. For public libraries and for popular use it must become a great favorite. It is a marvel of cheapness, being published at only \$1.50 per volume, on white paper, neatly bound, and handsomely illustrated; each volume containing between six and seven hundred pages.

HARPERS' HAND-BOOK for Travellers in Europe and the East: being a Guide through Great Britain and Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy, Sicily, Egypt, Syria, Turkey, Greece, Switzerland, Tyrol, Spain, Russia, Denmark and Sweden. By WILLIAM PEMBROKE FETRIDGE. With a Railroad Map, corrected up to 1867, and a Map embracing Colored Routes of Travel in the above Countries. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 12mo., pp. 662.

There are several reasons why Harpers' Hand-Book has taken precedence over every other. It is in one volume, while the European hand-books are in many volumes, a volume being appropriated to each country. It is prepared by an American for Americans, and, as he resides most of the time in Europe, he may be relied on for just such information as they need. This volume has been corrected up to May, 1867, and gives a skeleton tour through the principal cities and towns in the countries above named; with the different routes by land and water, and the cost of each; the names and charges of the leading hotels; the names of Churches, Galleries, works of Art, and places of interest to be visited, with the fees expected by custodians; and information about passports, &c., and respecting couriers, those necessary pests, and hints to protect against their imposition. The Messrs. Harper propose to publish a new edition every year, corrected up to the very latest date. It is bound in a flexible morocco cover, with pockets, in which are Maps, Railway charts, plans of cities, &c. While the volume is almost indispensable to the traveller, it is not without interest to those who stay at home. It should be examined carefully by those who contemplate a European or Eastern tour.

BRYAN MAURICE, or The Seeker. By Rev. WALTER MITCHELL. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1867. 12mo., pp. 288.

The Rector of St. Mark's Parish, Philadelphia, wields a most vigorous and graceful pen, and "Bryan Maurice" should be placed in every Parish and Sunday School Library in the Church. Our estimate of the volume appears in the pages of this Number.

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT of the Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York. Albany, 1867. 8vo., pp. 500.

The objects of this association are, to visit and aid persons arrested on a charge of crime, and held for trial or examination; to encourage and assist released prisoners who have reformed or desire to reform, and to suggest modifications in prisons and prison systems. During the past year 6,100 persons were visited in the various prisons of detention, who were poor, friendless, and in need of advice and counsel; 953 complaints were carefully examined; 303 complaints were withdrawn, on its advice, as frivolous, or founded in mistake, passion or prejudice; 280 prisoners were discharged from custody on its recommendation, who were either innocent, or very young, or clearly penitent; 1,407 liberated prisoners were aided with board or money; 175 discharged convicts were provided with work and situations; and 193 were supplied with clothing to a greater or less extent. This makes a total of 8,411 prisoners aided in some way and to some extent by the prison association, within the past year.

The following are the results of twenty-two years of labor by the association:

Number of persons visited in prison,	78,664
Number of complaints examined,	22,881

Number of complaints withdrawn,	6,283
Number of persons discharged from custody,	6,970
Number of released prisoners aided with board, clothing, tools or money, -	12,881
Number of discharged convicts provided with situations,	3,677

The general agent reports that during the year there were 42,621 arrests in this city; of these, two were hanged, and 377 sent to state prison; 20 died and one escaped. Of the others, about one-half were discharged and one-half sent to Blackwell's Island.

Of the 42,621 arrests, 15,841 were natives, and 26,980 foreign born; 27,570 were intemperate, and 15,051 of temperate habits. The number who could not read was 2,776, and the number of those who could read but not write, was 10,271. The greatest number of arrests was for disorderly conduct, 16,051; and the second highest, intoxication, 10,245.

This large volume gives full reports of the condition of the Jails, Penitentiaries and Prisons in the State of New York, and important suggestions from the results of Prison Discipline in English and Irish Prisons. It deserves the attention of all practical philanthropists.

REPORT OF THE PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES of the United States and Canada.

Made to the Legislature of New York, Jan. 1867. By C. C. WINES, D.D., LL.D., and THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL.D., Commissioners of the Prison Association of New York. Albany, 1867. 8vo., pp. 547.

This large volume covers a wide field, and presents a mass of information on the whole subject of Prison Discipline in the Prisons of nearly all the Northern, Middle, and Western States, and also in Canada. The subject is carefully treated in almost every possible aspect, and statistics and facts are gathered of great importance, not only to the philanthropist, but to the public at large. Crime, and its causes; Punishment, its modes and objects; Prisons, their management and the abuses practised in them; the physical, hygienic, industrial, economic, moral and religious aspects of the question; on all these and similar points the volume will be found full and satisfactory.

HARPERS' WRITING BOOKS. Symmetrical Penmanship with Marginal Drawing Lessons for Schools and Families. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1867.

Of this series, ten Numbers in all, four Numbers are before us. A special feature of this series is, that drawing and writing are both taught at the same time; and the main characteristics of the work are thus summed up by the publishers:

1. It is easily acquired, and rapidly written.
2. Every letter is symmetrical, being founded on geometrical principles, and of unvarying proportions. All letters of the same class are of the same height or length, the spacing is of the same width throughout, and the shading is uniform.
3. In the first two numbers of the series, copies on tinted ground are introduced for tracing with pen or pencil.
4. Oblique lines are printed on the pages, as guides to uniformity of slope and spacing.
5. All the small letters are introduced in the first book, and the capitals in the second; but that the pupil may become proficient in forming plain letters before attempting the ornamental, only one style of each is present in the first four books.
6. Every new copy introduces a new element, principle, rule, or illustration. Every combination of letters forms a word, and every combination of words forms an instructive sentence or phrase.
7. The correct uses of the marks of punctuation, of capital letters, and of abbreviations, are taught by illustrative copies, and by concise rules given on the covers.

We have seen no system, which promises to accomplish so much in this department, as that which is carefully developed in these books of the Messrs. Harper.

FREE EVENING SERVICE. The order for Daily Evening Prayer; with a Selection from the Authorized Psalms and Hymns (for Missionary use). Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co.

This neat little volume, of 128 pages, contains, first, the order for Daily Evening Prayer; secondly, the optional Psalter, i. e., the ten "Selections;" and thirdly, thirty of the Psalms in metre, carefully chosen, together with three times that number of the Hymns. A number of the "additional Hymns" are incorporated, such as "Nearer my God to Thee," "Keble's Evening Hymn," and "Jerusalem the Golden." The table of Evening Lessons is printed on the back of the title page. While this book must be very convenient for the purpose designed, we doubt the expediency of such compilations. Let the Prayer Book go in its integrity, and especially is this important in Missionary fields.

PAPERS OF THE RUSSO-GREEK COMMITTEE. Second Series. No. 1, the *Encyclical Epistle of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church to the Faithful everywhere*, being a reply to that Epistle of Pius IX. to the Easterns. Dated Jan. 6, 1848. New York, 1867. 8vo., pp. 48.

The Russo-Greek Committee have commenced the Second Series of their Papers, with a most important document. Extracts from this Encyclical Epistle have appeared from time to time, and we have repeatedly tried in vain to get a copy of it for the Review. It is the Reply of the Four Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with their Synods, to a Letter of Pius IX., in which he exhorts them to "return within the enclosure of the Fold of the Lord," and to communion with the "holy Throne of Peter." Rev. Dr. Young, the Editor of the Committee, now Bishop of Florida, has given, from Dr. Neale, a synopsis of the Pope's Epistle, and a member on the Committee has translated the Reply in full, which now appears in English for the first time. The Pope, after the experience of the last twenty years, would not venture on such an impudent proposition now; and the Reply from these Oriental Patriarchs and their Synods was something that he had not anticipated. Its thorough familiarity with every phase of the subject, the terrible severity of its reasonings, the boldness of its language, and yet its mild Christian tone, are worthy of its origin. The Notes by the Editor in the Appendix, comprise a large amount of historical matter of the greatest value.

THE RT. REV. BISHOP POTTER'S SERMON, at the Consecration of the Rt. Rev. H. A. NEELY, D.D., in Trinity Chapel, Jan. 25, 1867.

The clear ringing tones of this able and timely Sermon, produced, at the time of its delivery, a decided impression. We reproduce the following passages:

"In this country, then, as everywhere else, our branch of the Church stands in the *via media*—occupies the middle ground between Romanism on the one side, and ultra Protestantism on the other; between intellectual and spiritual bondage, at one extreme, and unbridled licentiousness of individual opinion, at the other extreme. * * * What a position is ours! Midway between a Church on the one side, which adds to her Creed when she pleases, takes away the Cup of Salvation from the Laity at her own sovereign will, (both measures true exponents of all her policy,) making her appeal not to Scripture, or the primitive witness, but to the judgment of her existing authorities, and arrogating to herself an infallibility which can belong only to the Church universal, duly represented in a general Council; and, on the other side, Sects which practically have no Creeds, and which, taught to prefer new things, even in religion, to the old, are liable to be blown about by every wind of doctrine, and condemned to receive, as oracles, the crude speculations of the last plausible popular thinker."

"Now the Church of God was Catholic before it was Protestant. It was Catholic before error arose. To be Catholic, universal in time and place, universal in the witness to her truth and order is of the essence of the Church. If she have not those elements which make her a branch of the Holy Catholic Church, she is poor indeed. But to be Protestant is an accident, owing to the springing up of error to be protested against. To put the two terms, Catholic and Protestant, on a level, as being equally essential to a description of the Church, is absurd. The one is inherent and vital; the other is one form of manifestation of the Catholic, protesting against what is not Catholic."

"And what has been the result? Read it in the 3,000 Churches erected in thirty years, instead of the fifty in the same period, as in the previous age. Read it in

the Colonial Bishoprics, endowed all round the globe, and served by noble, highly educated, Apostolic men. Read it in the million of pounds now being expended in missions among the poor and degraded in the single city of London. Read it in the labors of polished Clergymen and cultivated Laymen and women, in the lanes, and alleys, and dens of that fearful city."

"The historian of the great English rebellion tells us, that there was a certain class of persons, in his day, who were fond of calling "those whom they liked not, Papists;" and it has been so ever since. It is the favorite cry, sometimes of ignorance, sometimes of malice. To shield ourselves from the odium sought to be cast upon us by that cry, we have but to embrace a course of policy which is simple and easy. Treat the vital parts of the Baptismal and Eucharistic Offices as a dead letter; renounce the literal teaching of our great formularies; refuse to keep company any longer with the Primitive Fathers, or with the great masters of English divinity—the Jeremy Taylors, the Richard Hookers, the Bramhalls, the Bulls, the Hammonds, the Wilsons; degrade this branch of the Church into a Sect; recognize, not merely the personal excellence of individuals belonging to religious systems around us, which we do most cordially, but recognize the divine authority of the religious systems themselves; accept the language, the policies, the religious ideas which are derived from sources external to the Church: do this, and in one quarter, at least, we shall be relieved from censure. No, no! If our branch of the Church is to be the "Light of the world," she must be upheld and administered, in her true meaning and spirit. She must let her Light shine by her Catholic Truth, her Catholic Worship, and her Catholic Works. Her Truth is the Truth of Christ; her office is to set Christ before men."

Rev. Dr. MORGAN DIX'S SERMON, in Trinity Church, New York. Feast of St. Mark, 1867. 12mo., pp. 20. The Ritualistic History of the past fifty years.

The following extracts from this Sermon are worth reading, for several reasons. "Looking about this Church, we challenge any one to point out so much as one smallest object, which symbolizes Roman doctrine or Roman error. We disclaim, distinctly and earnestly, any sympathy with the peculiar views, practices, or teachings of Rome. It is not toward them we move; but toward that happy position, if it can be found, and it must be somewhere, at which all true Catholics may meet in unity of doctrine, discipline, and worship, and where no edict, whether it be promulgated from one extreme or the other, shall have power to vex and distress God's children." * * * "But, along with these, we have been also gaining, what is better far, a higher view of the position of our branch of the Church toward the rest of Christendom; a knowledge of her history; a love for those holy traditions which reach far back, across the stormy waters of the Reformation, into the era of the Six General Councils, and the First Age of the Church; a deepening reverence for her blessed sacraments; a more correct appreciation of the life to which we are called in her; a clearer view of our duty to ourselves, to men, and to God. I can bear witness that I have never seen so plainly, as within the past few years, the working of God's grace in the consciences of individuals; that I have never seen so much, as lately, of deep longing after holiness, of settled purpose to make His glory the end of existence, of earnest repentance for sin, of energizing faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. And behold how, on every side, the Church is putting forth her strength in active charities, in Missions at home and abroad, in enterprises for the succor of the orphan, the poor, and the lost; in efforts to win the masses, the laboring folk, and those who are living without God in the world! * * * There are agitators amongst us; men who cause divisions, who sow the seeds of dissension, and call names; but they are not of us, or at least we desire no such agencies to be employed on our side. We labor for peace. We do but ask, that this branch of the Catholic Church may have her rights, and be permitted to obey the law of her existence. We are not afraid of public opinion: at first it may be against us; it always comes out right, if you will give it time, and that which was our foe, ends in being our strongest ally. It is not a thing to be courted: it is not to be dreaded; it is only an aggregate of human opinions, and of how little consequence is human opinion in questions touching

divine truth! Ye who have at heart the glory of God, the welfare of men, and the salvation of the ungodly, be not afraid, nor impatient. Answer no man railing for railing; watch and pray, stand fast and trust in the Lord; assured that the same Hand which has led us on thus far, will continue to guide us toward higher, better, and holier things, in our vocation."

Messrs. Ticknor and Fields, Boston, have issued the following Works of Charles Dickens, in the uniform series of the Diamond Edition, which we noticed in our last Number:—

THE LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF MARTIN CHUZZLEWIT; With original Illustrations, by S. EYTINGE, JR., 12mo., pp. 480.

DOMBEY & SON; with original Illustrations, by S. EYTINGE, JR., 12 mo., pp. 501.

The following new publications have been received:—

NORA AND ARCHIBALD LEE. A Novel. By the Author of "Agnes Tremorne," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 156.

THE LAST CHRONICLE OF BARSET; By ANTHONY TROLLOPE, Author of "The Clay-erings," &c. &c., With Illustrations by GEORGE H. THOMAS. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 362.

RAYMOND'S HEROINE. A Novel. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 150.

MR. WYNYARD'S WARD. A Novel. By HOLME LEE; Author of "Sylvan Holt's Daughter," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 106.

LOUISA OF PRUSSIA AND HER TIMES. An Historical Novel; By L. MUHLBACH. Translated from the German by F. JORDAN. Complete in one Volume. With Illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1867. 8vo., pp. 277.

ALEC FORBES OF HOWGLEN. A Novel. By GEORGE MACDONALD, M. A.; Author of *Annals of a Quiet Neighborhood*, &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 171.

NO MAN'S FRIEND. A Novel. By FREDERICK WILLIAM ROBINSON; Author of "Grandmother's Money," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. 8vo., pp. 180.

CALLED TO ACCOUNT. A Novel. By Miss ANNIE THOMAS; Author of "On Guard," &c., &c. New York: 1867. 8vo., pp. 152.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop WHIFFLE'S ADDRESS to the Tenth Annual Convention of the Diocese of Minnesota, June 12, 1867. 8vo. pp. 20.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop STEVENS' SERMON, at the opening of the Anglo-American Church, Paris, April 25, 1867. 8vo., pp. 24.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop RANDALL'S SERMON, at the Consecration of the Rt. Rev. DANIEL S. TUTTLE, D. D., in Trinity Chapel, May 1, 1867. 12mo., pp. 36.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop CUMMINS' SERMON, before the Convention of Kentucky. "The Prayer Book a Basis of Unity." 1867. 8vo. pp. 15.

Rev. WILLIAM STOWE'S SERMON, before the Convention of the Diocese of Michigan, June 5, 1867. 12mo., pp. 19.

Rev. Dr. T. C. PITKIN'S SERMON, before Convocation at Rochester. "The Blessed Virgin." 1867. 12mo., pp. 16.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE'S LETTER to Rev. W. W. Andrews, on "The True Marks of the Church." 1867. 12mo., pp. 10.

Rev. JOHN FULTON'S LETTER, on "The Declaration of the Twenty Eight Bishops." 1867. 16mo., pp. 32.

Rev. Dr. S. TOTTEN'S LETTER, on Education. 1867. 16mo. pp. 32.

REPORT OF THE MISSION HOUSE, of the Protestant Episcopal Church Mission, Philadelphia. 1867. 8vo., pp. 16.

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT of St. Luke's Hospital, New York. 1867. 8vo., pp. 32.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE on the Episcopate of Maryland, touching the interests of the District of Columbia. 1867. 8vo., pp. 8.

REPORT of St. Luke's Parish, Germantown, Pa. 1867. 8vo., pp. 8.

FIRST ANNUAL MISSIONARY REPORT of Grace Church, Elmira, New York. 1867. 8vo., pp. 16.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT of the Pastoral Aid Society, of the Church of the Holy Trinity, New York City. 1867. 8vo., pp. 36.

AMERICAN CHRISTIAN COMMISSION, Document No. I. 1867. 8vo., pp. 55.

GODEY'S LADY'S BOOK. Edited by Mrs. Sarah J. Hale. Philadelphia.

The high literary character and the pure moral tone of this Monthly, together with its Fashion Department, its Receipts, &c., &c., have made the Magazine a favorite with the true women of the country.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF FLORIDA.

The Rev. JOHN FREEMAN YOUNG, D. D., Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York City, was consecrated Bishop of Florida, in Trinity Church, July 25th, being the Feast of St. James, the Apostle. There were present, the Rt. Rev. Bishops Hopkins of Vermont, Payne of Africa, Gregg of Texas, Odenheimer of New Jersey, Wilmer of Louisiana, and Cummins of Kentucky, and over one hundred Priests and Deacons. Morning Prayer having been said at 9 o'clock, the Services commenced at 11 o'clock. The choir sang, as the *Introit*, Psalm 140. The Bishop of New Jersey said the Ante-Communion Service, the responses being sung as arranged by *Rogers*. The Epistle was read by the Bishop of Louisiana, and the Gospel, by the Assistant Bishop of Kentucky. The Nicene Creed having been sung as an anthem, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilmer ascended the pulpit and preached the sermon, taking for his text, "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us," 2 Tim. 1: 13, 14. It was an admirable Discourse upon "The Book of Common Prayer as a bond of peace and unity among Christians, and a witness to the necessity of personal purity and holiness." The sermon being ended, the Bishop-elect was presented to the Presiding Bishop, by the Bishops of New Jersey and Texas. In response to the Presiding Bishop's demand for the Testimonials of the Bishop-elect, the Rev. Mr. Herrick, of Key West, read the certified extract from the Minutes of the Diocesan Convention of Florida, recording the election of Dr. Young. The Rev. Mr. Harrold, of Tallahassee, read the testimonials signed by the Convention. The Rev. Mr. Thackara, also of the Diocese of Florida, read the testimonials signed by the Standing Committees; and the Rev. Dr. Hobart, Registrar of the General Convention, read the consents of a large majority of the Bishops. The Bishop-elect then took the Episcopal Oath; after which the Presiding Bishop pronounced the call to prayer, and the Rev. Dr. Haight sang the Litany, with its special suffrage, and the special Prayer for the Bishop-elect. After the interrogatories were all duly answered, the Bishop-elect was vested with the rest of the Episcopal habit by his attending Priests, the Rev. Dr. T. M. Peters, of this city, and the Rev. John Fulton, of Columbus, Ga., and, kneeling down, the *Veni, Creator Spiritus*, was sung over him, and all the Bishops present united with the Presiding Bishop in the laying on of hands. The beautiful Anthem, from Mendelssohn's St. Paul, "Now we are ambassadors," was then sung, followed by the Chorus, "How beautiful are the feet."

The Offertory sentences were said by the Rev. Dr. F. Vinton, the alms being given to the Bishop of Florida, for Missions in his Diocese. The Prayer for the Church Militant was intoned by the Bishop of Texas, who also took the following parts of the service, until the Prayer of Humble Access, which was said by the Presiding Bishop, the celebrant. The Bishops all knelt in a semi-circle round the Altar, until they had received, at the hands of the Presiding Bishop: and they then administered, to the great number of the Clergy, and to the crowds of the Laity.

The Post-Communion was said by the Bishop of New Jersey, the Presiding Bishop saying the last special Collect, and giving the Blessing of Peace.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Austin, Thos. R.	Talbot,	Aug. 25, 1867,	St. Paul's, New Albany, Ind.
Badger, Henry L.	McIlvaine,	June 26,	" Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Betts, Thomas,	Clarkson,	June 16,	" Plattsmouth, Nebraska.
Blake, Alfred W.	McIlvaine,	June 26,	" Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Brainard, C. R.	Kemper,	June 24,	" Chapel, Nashotah Miss'n, Wis.
Brass, ———	Talbot,	Aug. 25,	" St. Paul's, New Albany, Ind.
Butler, C. E.	McIlvaine,	June 26,	" Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Butterworth, John F.	Potter,	June 21,	" Wainwright Mem'l, N. Y. City.
Cartel, J. A.	Clark,	June 7,	" Christ, Westerly, R. I.
Caskey, Toliver F.	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Clark, Rufus W., Jr.	Clark,	June 23,	" Grace, Providence, R. I.
Cowan, Enoch B.	Whipple,	June 16,	" Good Shepherd, Faribault, Min.
Crowe, Geo. Harden,	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Davidson, C. B., D. D.	Talbot,	Aug. 25,	" St. Paul's, New Albany, Ind.
Davidson, Alex.	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Davis, E.	Williams,	Aug. 13,	" St. George's, Schenectady, N. Y.
Dennison, Robt. E.	Coxe,	June 16,	" Christ, Oswego, W. N. Y.
Dickie, Thos. E.	Whipple,	June 16,	" Good Shepherd, Faribault, Min.
Dobbin, James,	Whipple,	June 16,	" Good Shepherd, Faribault, Min.
Dudley, Thos. U., Jr.	Johns,	June 28,	" Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Duyckinck, Henry,	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Hayden, Horace C.	Johns,	June 28,	" Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Hill, Jos. Warren,	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Hill, Simeon C.	Clark,	June 7,	" Christ, Westerly, R. I.
Hoge, C. Montgomery,	Kip,	July 16,	" St. John's Mission, Dolores, Cal.
Hullihen, Walter Q.	Johns,	June 28,	" Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Hunt, William H.	Quintard,	July 4,	" St. James, Marietta, Ga.
Hyde, William,	McIlvaine,	June 26,	" Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Jennings, D'Estaing,	Talbot,	July 14,	" St. Paul's, Indianapolis, Ind.
Kelly, S. P.	Stevens,	June 20,	" Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
Kemp, T. B.	Lee, H. W.	July 21,	" St. Mary's, Ottumwa, Iowa.
Kerfoot, Abel A.	Kerfoot,	July 31,	" Trinity, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Langford, Wm. M.	McIlvaine,	June 26,	" Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Latrobe, Benj. H., Jr.	Lee, A.	June 20,	" Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lewis, N. H.	Johns,	June 28,	" Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Lindholm, Jos. E.	Whipple,	June 16,	" Good Shepherd, Faribault, Min.
McCandless, John H.	Kerfoot,	June 16,	" Trinity, Pittsburgh, Pa.
McGlatheery, Wm.	Stevens,	June 20,	" Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
Murray, James,	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Nevin, Robert J.	Stevens,	July 21,	" Holy Trinity, Westchester, Pa.
Olin, R. A.	Coxe,	June 16,	" Christ, Oswego, W. N. Y.
Palmer, Geo. V.	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Pitts, Thos. Dorsey,	Kerfoot,	June 8,	" Grace, Baltimore, Md.
Plummer, Charles H.	Whipple,	June 16,	" Good Shepherd, Faribault, Min.
Reed, ———	Lee, A.	June 20,	" Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ritchie, Robert,	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Skeels, Amos,	Clark,	June 17,	" Christ, Westerly, R. I.
Spalding, Erastus W.	Talbot,	Mar. 17,	" St. Paul's, Evansville, Ind.
Steen, John F.	Potter,	June 9,	" Grace, Whitestone, N. York.
Stewart, W. B.	Johns,	June 28,	" Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Walter, Jer. E.	Clark,	June 7,	" Christ, Westerly, R. I.
Warner, Arthur H.	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Warriner, E. A.	Stevens,	June 20,	" Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
Way, Alonzo M.	Potter,	June 21,	" Wainwright Mem'l, N. Y. City.
Wenman, Charles A.	Potter,	June 30,	" Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Whitehead, Cortlandt,	Odenheimer,	June 21,	" Trinity, Newark, New Jersey.

PRIESTS.

Name.	Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Rev. Ackley, Wm. N.	Williams,	July 15, 1867,	St. Alban's, Danielsonville, Ct.
" Allen, C. D.	Stevens,	July 14, "	St. Stephen's, Harrisburg, Pa.
" Allen, Henry J. W.	Stevens,	June 20, "	Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Boyer, S. H.	McIlvaine,	May 19, "	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.
" Brewer, Legl. R.	Coxe,	June 15, "	Christ, Oswego, W. N. Y.
" Colton, Richard F.	Stevens,	June 20, "	Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Chetwood, F. B.	Odenheimer,	June 10, "	St. John's, Elizabeth, N. J.
" Davenport, J. A.	Kemper,	July 10, "	St. Paul's, Fond-du-Lac, Wis.
" Dolloway, Edwd. S.	Coxe,	June 15, "	Christ, Oswego, W. N. Y.
" Enmegahbowh, J. J.	Whipple,	June 20, "	Good Shepherd, Faribault, Min.
" Estabrook, Wm. W.	Lee,	June 7, "	Trinity, Davenport, Iowa.
" Gilliat, John H.	Williams,	July 16, "	Christ, Pomfret, Conn.
" Hartman, Henry F.	Kerfoot,	June 16, "	Trinity, Pittsburgh, Pa.
" Heath, J. B. G.	Potter,	June 21, "	Wainwright Mem'l, N. Y. City.
" Hewes, C. M. A.	Odenheimer,	June 10, "	St. John's, Elizabeth, N. J.
" Hooper, Montgom'ry,	Odenheimer,	June 21, "	Trinity, Newark, N. J.
" Jenckes, J. S.	Smith,	June 9, "	St. Paul's, Louisville, Ky.
" Judd, Henderson,	McIlvaine,	May 19, "	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.
" Marsden, Thos.	Potter,	June 21, "	Wainwright Mem'l, N. Y. City.
" Marshall, Royal,	Potter,	June 21, "	Wainwright Mem'l, N. Y. City.
" Meech, Robert,	Williams,	June 15, "	Christ, Hartford, Conn.
" Protheroe, John T.	Kerfoot,	June 16, "	Trinity, Pittsburgh, Pa.
" Rafter, George C.	Kerfoot,	June 16, "	Trinity, Pittsburgh, Pa.
" Ross, William,	Cummins,	June 9, "	St. Paul's, Henderson, Ky.
" Stewart, George W.	Potter,	June 21, "	Wainwright Mem'l, N. Y. City.
" Tate, Colin C.	Talbot,	May 19, "	Christ, Indianapolis, Ind.
" Turner, William,	Talbot,	Aug. 21, "	Grace, Indianapolis, Ind.
" Waller, Granville C.	Smith,	June 9, "	St. Paul's, Louisville, Ky.
" Walker, James,	Stevens,	June 20, "	Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Wilson, Jo. Dawson,	Kerfoot,	May 12, "	Calvary, East Liberty, Pa.
" Wright, John,	Lee, A.	June 20, "	Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.

CONSECRATIONS.

Name.	Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Christ,	Potter,	July 3, 1867,	Warwick, New York.
Christ,	Potter,	June 11, "	Ballston, New York.
Christ,	Odenheimer,	June 30, "	Bergen, New Jersey.
Christ,	Odenheimer,	June 23, "	Ridgewood, New Jersey.
Good Shepherd,	Green,	May 9, "	Terry, Miss.
Grace,	Potter,	June 13, "	Hart's Village, New York.
Grace,	Scott,	June 2, "	Astoria, Oregon.
Grace,	McIlvaine,	July 11, "	College Hill, Ohio.
Grace,	Potter,	June 9, "	Whitestone, New York.
St. Luke's,	Stevens,	June 21, "	Germantown, Pa.
St. Luke's,	Clarkson,	June 16, "	Plattsmouth, Nebraska.
St. Peter's,	Kip,	June 30, "	Redwood City, Cal.
Trinity,	Kerfoot,	July 17, "	Warren, Pa.

OBITUARIES.

The Rt. Rev. THOMAS FIELDING SCOTT, D. D., Missionary Bishop of Oregon and Washington Territories, died in New York City, July 14th, aged 62 years, of Panama Fever. Bishop Scott was, for many years, in his earlier life, a Presbyterian Minister, in Georgia. He happened, however, to get possession of a Prayer Book, and learned by heart many of its prayers, using them in preference to his own extemporaneous effusions. A further study of the book wrought a deeper change;

and, for several years, he was a Presbyterian of the Diocese, so far winning the confidence of the late lamented Bishop Elliott, that his influence, at the General Convention of 1853, secured the election of Dr. Scott as one of the two Missionary Bishops, then first elected, for the Pacific Coast. He was ordained Deacon, by the late Rt. Rev. Bishop Elliott, in St. Paul's Church, Augusta, Georgia, March 12, 1843. His first Parish was at Marietta, which was a new field, and where, within six years, there sprang up a beautiful parsonage, a Female Institute, and a glebe of twenty acres. In Feb. 1851, he became Rector of Trinity Church, Columbus, Ga; from which he was transferred to his Episcopal Missionary Diocese. Bishop Scott was not a "Low" Churchman, though generally regarded as such. His Article, in the Eleventh Volume of this Review, on Church Unity, was truly Catholic in its tone, and an Article, now in our hands from his pen, is even more decided in its teaching. One who knew him intimately, in his latter years, writes, that he "repudiated the Schismatical and destructive views," of a certain party in the Church, and "felt no sympathy, except for the Catholic Church of our Lord."

On the sudden death of Bishop Scott, in New York, the Clergy formally took charge of his remains, and every mark of affectionate respect was paid, which was so justly due to his memory. He was buried in Trinity Cemetery, July 16th, the Funeral Services having been held in Trinity Chapel. The Domestic Committee assumed the expenses of the burial, and the lot for the interment was generously given by the Rector of Trinity Parish.

The Rev. STEPHEN C. MILLETT died, May 28th, 1867, near Beloit, Wis., aged 57 years. He graduated at Amherst College, Mass., and was ordained by Bishop Griswold, at the age of 23 years. His earlier Ministry was spent as Missionary at Stafford, and other places in Western New York, and, about 1850, he removed to Beloit, where he performed the same kind of duty. The later years of his life were passed in great physical weakness, and quiet patience and submission.

Rev. ROBERT G. CHASE, Rector of the Church of St. Matthias, Philadelphia, died suddenly, by drowning, July 24th, off Mount Desert, on the coast of Maine, by the upsetting of a boat. He was in his 32d year. He was born at Hopkinton, N. H., Dec. 19, 1835; was educated in the Church; graduated at Burlington College in 1856, and was ordained Deacon by Bishop Doane, in St. Mary's Church, Burlington, Dec. 21, 1856. His first cure was at Pemberton, N. J.; and in 1859, he accepted the Rectorship of St. Matthias Parish, Philadelphia, where he labored with great zeal and success. Mrs. Chase, to whom he was married in 1853, was with him in the boat, and together they sank into the fatal deep.

CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

Rev. RUFUS W. CLARK, lately ordained Deacon in Rhode Island, was, formerly, a Dutch Reformed Presbyterian.

The Rev. C. B. DAVIDSON, D. D., formerly a Presbyterian preacher in Kentucky, has become a Candidate for Holy Orders in the Church.

THOS. R. AUSTIN, LL. D., formerly a Methodist preacher, has become a Candidate for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Indiana.

Mr. E. DAVIS, recently ordained Deacon, at Schenectady, N. Y., was formerly a Presbyterian Minister.

Mr. C. M. HOGG, lately ordained Deacon, in California, was formerly a Methodist preacher.

DIOCESAN INTELLIGENCE.

NEW YORK. REV. STEPHEN H. TYNG, JR.

Formal complaint has been made to the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New York, against the Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., for violation of the Canons of

the Church. The alleged offence is said to have been committed in the Diocese of New Jersey, where the Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., on Sunday, July 14, officiated in the Methodist place of worship at New Brunswick, both morning and evening, in disregard of the remonstrance and prohibition of the Rev. Dr. Stubbs, Rector of Christ Church.

On Tuesday, July 16, complaint was made to the Rt. Rev. Bishop Odenheimer, Bishop of New Jersey, in a paper signed by Rev. Alfred Stubbs, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, and the Rev. Edward B. Boggs, D. D., Rector of St. John's Church, New Brunswick. In accordance with the Canon, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Odenheimer has transmitted a copy of the complaint to the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New York, now the Ecclesiastical Authority, in the absence of the Bishop. The Standing Committee have appointed the following gentlemen as a Committee of enquiry, to investigate the charges brought against the Rev. S. H. Tyng, Jr. The Rev. William Walton, D. D., the Rev. Robert S. Howland, D. D., the Rev. S. M. Haskins, D. D., and William E. Curtis, Esq., and Richard Harrison, Esq.

The Canon said to have been violated, is as follows:—"No Minister belonging to this Church shall officiate, either by preaching, reading Prayers, or otherwise, in the Parish or within the parochial cure of another Clergyman, unless he have received express permission for that purpose from the Minister of the Parish or cure, or, in his absence, from the Church-Wardens and Vestrymen, or Trustees of the congregation, or a majority of them."

"Where Parish boundaries are not defined by law, or are not otherwise settled, they shall, for the purposes of this section, be defined by the civil divisions of the State, as follows: Parochial boundaries shall be the limits, as now fixed by law, of any village, town, township, incorporated borough, city, or the limits of some division thereof, which may have been recognized by the Bishop, acting with the advice and consent of the Standing Committee, as constituting the boundaries of a Parish."

"If there be but one Church or Congregation within the limits of such village, town, township, borough, city, or such division of a city, or town, as herein provided,—the same shall be deemed the parochial cure of the Minister having charge thereof. If there be two or more congregations or Churches therein, it shall be deemed the cure of the Ministers thereof; and the assent of a majority of such Ministers shall be necessary."* (Digest of the Canons, Title I., Canon 12, Sec. V. 1 and 2)

The defense publicly set up in behalf of the Rev. Mr. Tyng, is, that the Methodist congregation, before whom he officiated, are not within the jurisdiction of the Rev. Dr. Stubbs, Rector of Christ Church, who issued the prohibition. This plea, on its face, is well calculated to be popular, and has, undoubtedly, created some outside sympathy for Mr. Tyng. Yet it has no basis. The second clause of the above Canon is as clear and distinct in its meaning, as it can possibly be. Besides, the late Rev. Dr. Hawks, in his Treatise on the Constitution and Canons, (pp. 291-2.) informs us, that this supplemental clause of the Canon was specially enacted in 1829, in order to meet a particular case; and it was one precisely similar to that which has recently occurred in New Jersey. The details will be found in Dr. Hawks' work, as referred to. There can be no possibility of doubt or misunderstanding, as to the true meaning and intent of the Canon.

It ought to be remembered, that this case, of the Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., now to be investigated, is one which does not at all involve the question of party. It has nothing to do with High Church, or Low Church. Neither is it a question as to the expediency or in expediency of this particular Canon; though, on that point, sensible men, as it seems to us, will have but one opinion. It is simply a question of Law and order, common to all associate bodies of men. It is the question, whether a Presbyter of the Church, so long as he retains his position in the Church, is bound to conform to the Law which he has solemnly sworn to obey. That is the question, and the whole question.

And yet, it is not to be denied or forgotten, that there has been developed, in the last few years, a determination to violate the established Laws and Canons of the Church, in respect to Ministerial Order. Certain of our Clergy, mostly young men, have publicly avowed their fixed purpose to practically recognize the Validity of

the Orders of the Sects around us. The moderate men, so called, of a few years ago, would have shrunk from any such proposal or conduct. Even Bishop Griswold said, in his Sermon: "Down to this present time, no ancient Church has been found, or can be named, that is, or has been, without the Episcopal government. * * * If differing Denominations of Christians are ever brought to strive together for the Faith of the Gospel, it will be, by their first uniting in the government, (whatever they may decide it to be,) *which God has set in His Church.*"

The moderate Bishop White, in his Address, uttered his words of warning, as follows:—

"Of all mistaken expedients for the increase of Union, there cannot be any one of them more delusive, than the prospect here contemplated; *professed to be for the combining in Worship of bodies of Christians now disjoined.* Instead of this, it tends to the opposite effect, of dividing our Church, as existing in its present form; and, into how many separate, and, perhaps, hostile communions, it is impossible to foresee."—(Gen. Theol. Sem. Address, 1828, p. 10.)

"The conduct to be recommended is, to treat every denomination, in their character as a body, with respect; and the individuals composing it, with degrees of respect, or of esteem, or of affection, in proportion to the ideas entertained of their respective merits; and to avoid all intermixture of administrations in what concerns the faith, or the worship, or the discipline of the Church." * * * "We must, to be consistent, interdict all other than an *Episcopal Ministry, within our bounds.*"—(Conv. Address, 1822.)

CONNECTICUT.

DIVISION OF THE DIOCESE.—At the Annual Convention, held, June 11th, in St. Paul's Church, New Haven, the Rev. Dr. Mead read the final Report of the Committee appointed at the Convention of 1865, on the division of the Diocese. It was signed by all the surviving members of the Committee. At the Convention a year ago, it was

Resolved, That the Committee on the Division of the Diocese, be requested to mature some plan, to be presented to the next Convention, whereby any portion of the Diocese asking to be set off, may, by some conference with the Convention, still retain some relation, after the manner of the Provincial system, with the original Diocese.

The Committee now Report, that, in their judgment, the time for Division has not yet come; but, they add, that whenever the parishes on the East of the Connecticut River shall ask to be set off as a separate jurisdiction, it will be a Providential indication of the duty of the Convention; and a division ought to be, under such circumstances, granted. The Report was accepted, and the Committee discharged from further consideration of the subject. In the course of the discussion, the Bishop said: "He had merely stated what he thought the best way of doing the work of the Church; but if the Convention did not agree with him, he yielded to them. He wished we might be looking forward to the formation of a new Missionary Diocese East of the River; but he did not advocate haste. Queen Mary asserted, that Calais would be found, after her death, written on her heart; he believed that Eastern Connecticut would be found on his. He did not ask the Convention to discuss the matter; nay, he asked them not to discuss it, but to pray about it, and then to decide; and with such a decision he would be perfectly satisfied."

EASTERN CONVOCATION OF THE DIOCESE.

At a recent meeting of this Convocation, held in Calvary Church, Stonington, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Whereas, The Bishop of the Diocese has, on more than one recent occasion, formally presented to the Convention his desire for a *division of the Diocese*, and has, in the most earnest manner, urged the necessity of such a movement, and

Whereas, At its last session, the Diocesan Convention did, in fact, assent to such division, by voting that, "Whenever the parishes East of the Connecticut River

shall ask to be set off, as a separate jurisdiction, it will be a Providential indication of the duty of the Convention, and a division ought to be, under such circumstances, granted." Therefore

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Convocation, such a division, if practicable, is much to be desired, and is necessary to the satisfactory growth and extension of the Church in these parts; and that a Committee of nine be appointed—to consist of five Clergymen and four Laymen, who shall take the whole matter into consideration, and report at a special meeting, to be held during the month of October, in St. James' Church, New London, subject to their call,—and that at such meeting, all the parishes East of the Connecticut River be invited to be represented by their Clergy, and by Lay Delegates, as in the Annual Diocesan Convention.

The Committee appointed under the "Resolution" were as follows:—

The Rev. J. C. Middleton, the Rev. D. F. Banks, the Rev. R. A. Hallam, D. D., the Rev. J. H. Gilliat, the Rev. W. N. Ackley, Charles A. Lewis, Esq., New London; E. Winslow Williams, Esq., Norwich; Edmund Wilkinson, Esq., Putnam; George E. Palmer, M. D., Stonington.

At a meeting of the Trustees of Trinity College, held June 11th, the Rev. A. Jackson, D. D., LL. D., President of Hobart College, was unanimously elected to the Presidency of Trinity College, which office had remained vacant, after the election of Dr. Kerfoot to the Bishopric of Pittsburgh. By this action, the College recalls to its Faculty, one who is an alumnus of the College, and was, for twenty-one years, a member of its Faculty, leaving it, in the year 1858, to take the Presidency of Hobart.

WESTERN NEW YORK.—DIVISION OF THE DIOCESE.

The Annual Convention of this Diocese met in Trinity Church, Elmira, Aug. 21st. On the second day, the Rev. Dr. Shelton read the Report of the Committee of Fifteen on the Division of the Diocese. The Report gave the questions addressed by the Committee to various parts of the Diocese, and stated that the answers were nearly unanimous in favor of Division, and of the meridian line through Seneca Lake. Dr. Shelton's report ended by proposing three Resolutions:—

1st. That it is expedient that the Diocese of Western New York should be divided.

2d. That the line of Division should be the Eastern boundaries of the counties of Wayne, Ontario, Yates, Schuyler and Steuben.

3d. That the portion East of this line should be declared to be the "new Diocese."

The Rev. Dr. Babcock then read the report of sub-Committee of the Committee of Fifteen, on the Diocesan Funds, and the disposition of them. The Report proposed six Resolutions, in addition to the three previously reported:—

4th. Leaving Diocesan Institutions, with their funds, undivided, and subject to local control.

5. That all Funds, except the Van Waganen, be equally divided.

6. That a Committee of three legal experts draft a form of a bill necessary to give effect to foregoing Resolutions, and see to its passage through the Legislature.

7. That same Committee ascertain what action of General Convention may be necessary, to give legal effect to the same.

8. Recommended the See Principle, for the adoption of each of the new Dioceses.

9. That the General Convention be asked for a permissive Canon, allowing a Federative Council of the Dioceses of this State, (the Provincial System.)

The whole subject was thus before the Convention. After much discussion, the vote was taken on the 1st Resolution, by orders, the Lay deputies being called first, by parishes. The result was as follows:—

Lay vote, Ayes 74, Noes 8; divided, 1; Clerical vote, Ayes 100, Noes 2.

There were 85 parishes represented in Convention, but two did not answer, or were absent.

The second Resolution, on the line of Division, was then taken up. The Rev. Dr. Guion, of Seneca Falls, offered, as a substitute, the "Southern Tier" line, the

northern boundary of Broome, Tioga, Tompkins, Schuyler, Steuben, Livingston, and the West bounds of Monroe. At length, Dr. Guion's substitute was put to vote by orders. The roll-call resulted as follows: Clerical vote, Ayes 27, Nays, 63; Lay vote, Ayes 21, Nays 45. So the Southern Tier plan was rejected.

The second Resolution, giving the line first reported, was then adopted, with but three votes in the negative.

The third Resolution was then passed, *nem. con.*,—making the Eastern the *new* Diocese. All the other Resolutions were then successively put to vote, and carried, except the eighth, which recommended the adoption of the See principle in each Diocese, and which was laid upon the table, for the reason that no time was left for properly discussing it. It will be brought up at the next Convention. The Resolution on the Provincial System, (the ninth and last,) was passed unanimously.

The whole discussion was conducted vigorously and thoroughly, yet in an excellent spirit, and was participated in by both Clergy and Laity.

ILLINOIS.

At the Convention of this Diocese, several matters, of more than ordinary interest, came up.

Rev. Clinton Locke, from the Special Committee, to whom was referred that portion of the Bishop's Annual Address relating to Marriage and Divorce, reported, recommending the adoption of the following Resolution:—

Resolved, That the deputies, representing this Diocese in the next General Convention, be instructed to use their best endeavors to procure, by general Canon Law, with suitable qualifications, a prohibition of the use of the Marriage Service of the Church, in cases where either party, contemplating Marriage, shall have been previously divorced by the civil law, on grounds other than those of adultery, and also to procure a rule of duty, to be followed by Clergymen, whose services are thus applied for, in ascertaining the facts bearing upon such prohibition.

The Resolution was adopted.

REPORT ON THE CATHEDRAL SYSTEM.—Rev. Dr. Ryland, from the Special Committee, appointed on that portion of the Bishop's Address relating to the Cathedral System, reported, submitting and recommending the adoption of the following Preamble and Resolutions:—

Whereas, The Cathedral, with its due complement of laborers, and auxiliary institutions, is an essential part of the equipment of a Bishop, for the due discharge of his manifold duties to the Church and to the world; and

Whereas, The Cathedral should be, in some sort, a representative institution of the Diocese—a grand and living witness of the truth and order, and the charities of the Church—a light held aloft, to which all the crowds of a great city may look, as a witness of the work the Church is everywhere beginning to do; and

Whereas, The Bishop of this Diocese has reported to this Convention the success that has followed his efforts to found and expand the Cathedral system in this Diocese, modified to meet the special conditions and wants of the Church in this country, a success beyond his expectations, attended by the fact that, already, the dimensions of the Cathedral edifice are too narrow; therefore

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this Convention, the work, so auspiciously begun, should be carried on, to a nearer attainment of what is required for worship, Christian instruction, and the offices of divine charity.

Resolved, That, at least, the contemplated chapel and library should be speedily completed, by the offerings of individuals, or parishes, in the Diocese of Illinois. These Resolutions were adopted.

PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.—The Provincial Committee moved the re-affirmation of the following:—

Resolved, That the Diocesan Convention of Illinois declare itself to be in favor of an early adoption, in this country, of a Provincial System, adapted to the condition and wants of the Church in the United States; and the General Convention is requested, at its next session, to provide the necessary legislation to accomplish this end.

Resolved, That this Convention is in favor of changing the names of our General and Diocesan Conventions, to those of General and Diocesan Councils.

Resolved, That a Committee of seven Laymen, to act in connection with the Clergymen of Chicago, be appointed by this Convention, whose duty it shall be to ascertain what need exists, in this city, for the organization of a Church, and the establishment of Services, for the colored population of this city; that the Committee be requested to take prompt action; and, if a need be found to exist for a parish, that said Committee be requested to use all proper efforts to collect, by subscription, or otherwise, in the city, a sufficient sum to purchase or put up a building, and establish said Services.

The Resolutions were adopted.

NORTH CAROLINA.—THE ST. AUGUSTINE NORMAL SCHOOL AND COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE.

The Executive Committee propose to establish a school with the above title, at Raleigh, N. C., for which a Charter has been already obtained. This school is designed to educate teachers, of both sexes, for the instruction of the colored people of the South. "Such a School," in the language of Bishop Atkinson, "seems to be altogether indispensable, to the effectual accomplishment of the good work on which the Church has entered." In this work, the Committee have been largely aided by the Trustees of the Avery Estate, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and by Major-General Howard, Commissioner of the Bureau of R. F. and A. L., to whom they return their most grateful thanks.

In addition to this school, it is proposed, by Bishop Atkinson, and certain leading Clergymen and Laymen of the Diocese of North Carolina, to establish a Training School for the preparation of colored men for the sacred Ministry.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—OPENING OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SCHOOL FOR FREEDMEN.

This Institution, at Charleston, was formally opened, with appropriate ceremonies, June 9, 1867. The building was, formerly, the Marine Hospital, and will accommodate seven hundred scholars. The Teachers are, one Superintendent and four Assistants, appointed, on the recommendation of the Clergy of Charleston, by the Freedmen's Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. The following is the list of teachers:—

Principal, W. W. Taylor, Geneva, N. Y. 1st Assistant, Mrs. Hume Simmons, Charleston. 2d Assistant, Miss Virginia Hammond, Charleston. 3d Assistant, Miss Helen Hammond, Charleston. 4th Assistant, Miss Clelia Gibbes, Charleston. The Rev. Dr. Hanckel, the Rev. A. Toomer Porter, the Rev. C. P. Gadsden, the Rev. C. C. Pinckney, and others, took part in the services.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

IRELAND.

The Rt. Rev. WILLIAM HIGGIN, D. D., Lord Bishop of Derry, died at the palace, suddenly, July 12th, at the age of 72 years.

Bishop Higgin was the only son of the late John Higgin, Esq., of Greenfield, Lancaster, where he was born, in 1793. He was educated, first, at the Lancaster Grammar School, where the late Dr. Wheeler was his schoolfellow, and afterwards at the Manchester Grammar School. Thence he removed to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated B. A., or 13th Wrangler, in 1817, the celebrated Hugh James Rose being 1st Wrangler; Dr. Collier, the Master of Jesus,

19th Wrangler of the same year. His first Clerical duty in Ireland was, as Chaplain to the Richmond Penitentiary, in 1820, and, subsequently, Chaplain to the Magdalen Asylum; after which, he became Rector of Roscrea, in 1828, and Vicar-General of Killaloe, in 1834, Dean of Limerick, in 1844, Bishop of Limerick, in 1849, and, finally, he was translated to Derry, in 1853. The Bishop, though a Cambridge man, took his degree of M. A. in 1823, and D. D. in 1848, at Trinity College, Dublin. Upon the resignation of Archbishop Whately, in 1853, he was appointed, in his place, a Commissioner of National Education; and, at the death of the late Bishop Plunket, he succeeded him as an Ecclesiastical Commissioner. Both these offices become vacant by the Bishop's lamented death. Bishop Higgin married, in 1820, Mary, daughter of Thomas Chippendale, Esq., of Blackburn, by whom he had a large family, several of whom survive him.

The Rev. WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D. D., Dean of Emly, has been appointed to the See of Derry and Raphoe. He was born at Derry, in April, 1824, and was the eldest son of the Rev. Robert Alexander, who held the Rectory and Prebend of Aghadoey, near Coleraine, in the Diocese. The Bishop elect received the rudiments of his education at Tunbridge School, and afterwards distinguished himself as a school boy at Winchester. Thence he went to Oxford, and entered at Brasenose, whence he graduated "Honorary Fourth" in classics, in 1847. Here he gained friends and honors. He obtained the Denyer Theological prize in 1850. He was also distinguished as a poet. In 1857, he carried off the University prize by his poem—"The Waters of Babylon," and lately, he was a candidate for the vacant chair of Poetry at Oxford.

ENGLAND.—CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

The Rev. Dr. THOMAS LEIGH CLAUGHTON, of Trinity College, Oxford, late vicar of Kidderminster, was consecrated Bishop of Rochester, June 11th. The services were held in the Cathedral of his own Diocese. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Oxford and Salisbury, were Consecrators. The Sermon was by the Rev. H. A. Woodgate, B. D., honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral, proctor in Convocation for the Clergy of that Diocese, and Rector of Belbroughton. He selected for his text, Matt. xiii. 52—"Every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of Heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." He remarked that that Diocese was twelve hundred years old, and he did not know why, during more than six hundred years, a Bishop had not been consecrated within its Cathedral. However, the 98th Bishop of Rochester was about being consecrated there that day, and he trusted that it was a return to a better state of things.

COMMISSION ON RITUAL.

WHITEHALL, June 6, 1867.

The Queen has been pleased to issue a Commission, under Her Majesty's Royal sign manual, to the effect following, viz:—

"Victoria, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, to the Most Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and right entirely-beloved Councillor Charles Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury; the Most Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and right entirely-beloved Councillor Marcus Gervais, Archbishop of Armagh; our right trusty, and right well-beloved Cousin Philip Henry, Earl Stanhope; our right trusty and right well-beloved Cousin and Councillor Dudley, Earl of Harrowby, Knight of our most Noble Order of the Garter; our right trusty and right well-beloved Cousin Frederick, Earl Beauchamp; the Right Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor, Archibald Campbell, Bishop of London; the Right Reverend Father in God, Connop, Bishop of St. David's; the Right Reverend Father in God, Samuel, Bishop of Oxford; the Right Reverend Father in God, Charles John, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; our right trusty and well-beloved Edward Berkeley, Baron Portman; our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Robert, Baron

Ebury; our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Spencer Horatio Walpole; our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Edward Cardwell; our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Sir Joseph Napier, Bart.; our trusty and well-beloved Sir William Page Wood, Knt., a Vice Chancellor; our trusty and well-beloved Sir Robert Joseph Phillimore, Knt., Doctor of Civil Law, our Advocate; our trusty and well-beloved Travers Twiss, Doctor of Civil Law; our trusty and well-beloved John Duke Coleridge, Esq., one of our Counsel learned in the Law; our trusty and well-beloved John Abel Smith, Esq.; our trusty and well-beloved Alexander James Beresford, Beresford Hope, Esq.; our trusty and well-beloved John Gellibrand Hubbard, Esq.; our trusty and well-beloved Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of our Collegiate Church of Westminster; our trusty and well-beloved Harvey Goodwin, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of our Cathedral Church of Ely; our trusty and well-beloved James Amiraux Jeremie, Doctor in Divinity, Dean of our Cathedral Church of Lincoln, Regius Professor of Divinity in our University of Cambridge; our trusty and well-beloved Robert Payne Smith, Doctor in Divinity, Regius Professor of Divinity in our University of Oxford; our trusty and well-beloved Henry Venn, Clerk, Bachelor of Divinity; our trusty and well-beloved William Gilson Humphry, Clerk, Bachelor in Divinity; our trusty and well-beloved Robert Gregory, Clerk; and our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Walter Perry, Clerk, Greeting. Whereas it has been represented unto us, that differences of practice have arisen from varying interpretations put upon the rubrics, orders, and directions for regulating the course and conduct of public worship, the administration of the Sacraments, and the other Services contained in the Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, and more especially with reference to the ornaments used in the Churches and Chapels of the said United Church, and the vestments worn by the Ministers thereof, at the time of their ministration.

"And whereas it is expedient, that a full and impartial inquiry should be made into the matters aforesaid, with the view of explaining or amending the said rubrics, orders, and directions, so as to secure general uniformity of practice in such matters as may be deemed essential.

"Now know ye that we, reposing great confidence in your ability and discretion, have nominated, constituted, and appointed, and by these presents do constitute, nominate, and appoint you to be our Commissioners, for the purpose of the said inquiry.

"And we do hereby enjoin you, or any ten or more of you, to make diligent inquiry into all and every the matters aforesaid, and to report thereupon, from time to time, as to you, or any ten or more of you, may appear to be most expedient, having regard, not only to the said rubrics, orders, and directions, contained in the said Book of Common Prayer, but also to any other laws or customs relating to the matters aforesaid, with power to suggest any alterations, improvements, or amendments, with respect to such matters, or any of them, as you, or any ten or more of you, may think fit to recommend.

"And whereas it has further been represented unto us, that some alterations may advantageously be made in the proper lessons appointed to be read in morning and evening prayer, on the Sundays and holydays throughout the year, and in the calendar with the table of First and Second Lessons contained in the said Book of Common Prayer:

"Now, we hereby further enjoin you, or any ten or more of you, after you have completed and reported on the matters referred to in the former part of this Commission, to inquire into and consider the Proper Lessons so appointed to be read as aforesaid, and the table of First and Second Lessons contained in the said Book of Common Prayer, with the view of suggesting and reporting to us, whether any and what alterations and amendments may be advantageously made in the selections of Lessons to be read at the time of Divine Service.

"And for the better discovery of the truth in the premises, we do by these presents give and grant unto you, or any ten or more of you, full power and authority to call before you, or any ten or more of you, such persons as you shall judge necessary, by whom you may be the better informed of the truth in the premises, and to inquire of the premises, and every part thereof, by all other lawful ways and means whatsoever.

"And our further will and pleasure is, that you, our said Commissioners, do, with as little delay as may be consistent with a due discharge of the duties hereby imposed upon you, certify unto us, under your hands and seals, or under the hands and seals of any ten or more of you, your several proceedings in the premises.

"And we do further will and command, and by these presents ordain, that this our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you, our said Commissioners, or any ten or more of you, shall, and may, from time to time, proceed in the execution thereof, and of every matter or thing therein contained, although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment.

"And for your assistance in the execution of this our Commission, we have made choice of our trusty and well-beloved William Francis Kemp, Esq., Barrister-at-law, to be the Secretary to this our Commission, and to attend you, whose services and assistance we require you to use, from time to time, as occasion may require.

"Given at our Court at St. James, the 3rd day of June, 1867, in the thirtieth year of our reign.

"By her Majesty's command,

GATHORNE HARDY."

THE REPORT ON RITUALISM.

The Commission upon the Ritual of the Church of England have agreed upon the following Report:—

"TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.—Your Majesty having been graciously pleased to issue a Commission, reciting, that 'differences of practice have arisen from varying interpretations put upon the rubrics, orders, and directions, for regulating the course and conduct of public Worship, the administration of the Sacraments, and other Services contained in the Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, and more especially with reference to the ornaments used in the Churches and Chapels of the said United Church, and the vestments worn by the Ministers thereof, at the time of their ministration,' and that 'it is expedient that a full and impartial inquiry should be made into the matters aforesaid, with the view of explaining or amending the said rubrics, orders and directions, so as to secure general uniformity of practice in such matters as may deemed essential,'—and enjoining your Commissioners, 'to make diligent inquiry into all and every the matters aforesaid, and to report thereupon, from time to time, as to' them 'or any ten or more of' them, 'may appear to be most expedient, having regard, not only to the said rubrics, orders, and directions contained in said Book of Common Prayer, but also to any other laws or customs relating to the matters aforesaid, with power to suggest any alterations, improvements, or amendments, with respect to such matters, or any of them, as' they, 'or any ten or more of' them, 'may think fit to recommend.' We, your Majesty's Commissioners, have, in accordance with the terms of your Majesty's Commission, directed our first attention to the question of the vestments worn by the Ministers of the said United Church, at the time of their ministration, and especially to those the use of which has been lately introduced into certain Churches. We find that, while these vestments are regarded by some witnesses as symbolical of doctrine, and by others, as a distinctive vesture, whereby they desire to do honor to the Holy Communion, as the highest act of Christian Worship, they are by none regarded as essential, and they give grave offense to many. *We are of opinion, that it is expedient to restrain, in the public services of the United Church of England and Ireland, all variations in respect to vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said United Church, and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress.* We are not yet prepared to recommend to your Majesty the best mode of giving effect to these conclusions, with a view at once to secure the objects proposed, and to promote the peace of the Church: but we have thought it our duty, in a matter to which great interest is attached, not to delay the communication to your Majesty of the results at which we have already arrived. We have placed, in the Appendix, the evidence of the witnesses examined before us, the documents referred to in the evidence, or produced before the Commissioners, the cases laid

before us, which were submitted to eminent counsel on either side of the question, together with the opinions thereupon; also, the report on the subject, made by the Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and the Resolution passed by the Upper, as well as the Lower House of that Convocation, and the Resolutions passed by the Convocation of the Province of York. All which we humbly beg leave to submit to your Majesty."

C. T. Cantuar,
Stanhope,
Beauchamp,
C. St. David's,
C. J. Gloucester and Bristol,
Spencer H. Walpole,
Joseph Napier,
*Robert J. Phillimore,
John Duke Coleridge,
*A. J. B. Beresford-Hope,
Arthur Penrhyn Stanley,
J. E. Jeremie,
Henry Venn,
Robert Gregory,
M. G. Armagh,

Harrowby,
A. C. London,
S. Oxon,
Portman,
Ebury,
Edward Cardwell,
Wm. Page Wood,
Travers Twiss,
John Abel Smith,
J. G. Hubbard,
H. Goodwin,
R. Payne Smith,
W. G. Humphrey,
†Thomas Walter Perry.

Aug. 19, 1867.

CONVOCAION : PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

On Tuesday, June 4th, Convocation assembled. In the Upper House, there were present, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Winchester, St. David's, Lichfield, Oxford, Llandaff, Lincoln, Salisbury, Norwich, Bangor, Gloucester and Bristol, and Ely.

The members of the Lower House assembled in the Jerusalem Chamber, under the Presidency of the Venerable Archdeacon Bickersteth, the Prolocutor. Among those present were, Dean Stanley, (Westminster,) Dean Alford, (Canterbury,) the Dean of St. Asaph, the Archdeacons of London, Taunton, Gloucester, Bristol, Bedford, Stowe, Oxford, Berks, and Canon Blakesley, Sir Frederick Ouseley, Lord Alwyne Compton, Sir Henry Thompson, Mr. Chancellor Massingberd, Dr. Jebb, Mr. Oxenham, Mr. Joyce, Dr. Fraser, Mr. Canon Hawkins, Mr. Canon Cooke, and Mr. Francis Cobb, the Actuary. The Session opened with the usual Latin prayers.

In the Lower House, Chancellor Massingberd brought forward the following motion.

"That an humble representation be addressed to His Grace, the President, and their Lordships of the Upper House, as follows;—That, according to the constitutional principles of this Church and realm, no alteration should be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or with the Rubrics thereof, until the advice of the Clergy, in their Convocations, has been first obtained, touching the same, and that the fact of such alterations having been so adopted by the Synods of the Church, ought to

* "We agree to the main proposition contained in this Report, and have therefore signed it, upon the understanding that it does not exclude the consideration of cases, in which the authority of the Bishop, and the rights of the parishioners and congregations, are carefully guarded.

ROBERT J. PHILLIMORE,
A. J. B. BERESFORD-HOPE."

† "In signing this Report, I think it right to express my conviction, that any power to 'restrain' the 'variations in respect of vesture,' to which the Report refers, ought to be limited to cases in which 'grave offense' is likely to be given, by introducing such 'vesture' into Churches, against the mind of the people; and also to state, that by 'aggrieved parishioners,' I understand to be meant, those who, being bona fide members and communicants of the Church of England, have a reasonable ground for 'complaint and redress.'

THOMAS W. PERRY."

be formally recited in any Act of Parliament by which the same may be enforced, in accordance with the precedent finally established by the words recited in the Statute 13th and 14th of Charles II., cap. 4, sec. 1, to that effect. And, further, to represent the deep conviction of this House, that if such a course was thought necessary when all members of Parliament were deemed to be, or were required to be, members of the Church of England, the abandonment of that course of proceeding, now that Parliament is composed of persons of all diversities of creed, must, in all likelihood, be followed by most disastrous results."

This motion the Chancellor sustained by an able argument. The Dean of Westminster made the usual exhibition of himself. He said, "No one could dispute, that the Legislature had often waited for the voice of this Synod of the Province of Canterbury, and he could point out, that the Legislature had often acted without consulting Convocation, and the effect of that legislation had been most beneficial to the country. The Legislature acted, in the reign of Edward VI., in the passing of the two great Acts regarding the Thirty-nine Articles and the Second Prayer Book. Doubts had been expressed as to these Acts being passed without the concurrence of Convocation, but there was little room for such doubts."

Such a perversion of the facts of History, called up the Rev. J. W. Joyce, whose statements we should be glad to quote, if we had room.

After some conversation, the resolution of Chancellor Massingberd was put and carried by a large majority, and the amendment, as altered by Mr. Bramston, was rejected.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

A meeting in furtherance of the objects of this Society, was held on Friday, May 10th, at St. James' Hall. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, and there were also present, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Chester, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of St. Asaph, the Bishop of Antigua, Archdeacon Bickersteth, Canon Hawkins, the Rev. Dr. Miller, Dr. Currey, Dr. Biber, Mr. T. Acland, M. P., Lord Lyttleton, &c.

The Report stated, that during the year 1866, the Bible and Prayer Book work of the Society had been carried on with undiminished activity, upwards of 837,000 copies having been circulated, at a charge upon the charitable fund of the Society of 14,000*l*. Religious books and tracts and publications, of an instructive and entertaining, though not of a directly religious character, had been circulated, to the number of 6,097,528. Frequent grants of books had been made to soldiers, sailors, and the militia. The document then went on to say, "Parochial libraries have been assisted in very many parts of England, and there is scarcely any kind of institution or asylum for the benefit of the poor, that does not find its place in the list of objects helped by special grants of books, made during the last twelve months. Hospitals, asylums, homes, reformatories, penitentiaries, ragged schools, young men's associations, working men's institutes, and many others, are among the number.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The sixty-eighth anniversary of this Society was held on Tuesday, April 30th, in the large room, Exeter Hall; the chair was taken by the Right. Hon. the Earl of Chichester. Amongst the Right Rev. Prelates, Clergy, and other gentlemen present, were, the Bishop of Norwich, the Bishop of Carlisle, the Bishop of Cork, the Bishop of Victoria, the Bishop of Nelson, the Bishop of Grafton and Armidale, the Hon. A. Kinnaird, M. P.; Hon. S. R. Curzon, &c., &c. Receipts, from all sources, £150,356 5*s*. 10*d*.

The local funds raised in the Missions, and expended there upon the operations of the Society, but independently of the General Fund, are not included in the foregoing statement.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

We are compelled to make a special appeal to such of our subscribers as are in arrears in their payment for the REVIEW. Notwithstanding the greatly increased cost of every item of expense in the publication, the terms of the REVIEW have never been raised. It is still offered at \$3.00 per volume. To sustain the work at this low price, we are obliged to conduct it on a strictly Cash basis. For ourselves we ask no credit, and we give no promissory Notes. Paper-makers, compositors, pressmen, binders, clerks, &c., are paid as soon as their work is done. By thus taking advantage of the lowest market prices, we are able to offer the REVIEW on the same terms as before the War. A considerable number of our subscribers pay their subscriptions strictly in advance, and at the beginning of the volume; and to these we present our most grateful acknowledgments. We regret to say, that a very large number are still indebted, for one, two, three, and even more volumes. In most instances, the delay is, doubtless, the result of mere carelessness or inadvertence. The sums are small, separately, but, in the aggregate, they reach a very large amount; *and their immediate payment is to us a matter, not of convenience, but of the most absolute and pressing necessity.* Bills have been, or soon will be, forwarded by Mail; and to these we ask prompt attention. Where the Bill is over \$3.00, payment should be made, if practicable, by Postal Order, or by Draft on some New York house, made payable to the order of the undersigned. Where a Receipt is to be returned by Mail, a postage stamp should be enclosed.

In this connection we desire to say, that in addition to our former corps of contributors, some writers have been engaged on the REVIEW of established reputation in the world of letters, men who know how

to be learned without being stupid, and attractive without being sensational. While we have every reason to be gratified with the success of the **REVIEW**, and with the judgments passed upon it by critics of the highest reputation abroad and at home, yet we are determined to raise its intellectual standard; still greater care will be taken in the admission of Articles, and we shall aim to make the **REVIEW** more effective, more worthy of the Church, and better deserving the careful reading of all intelligent Churchmen. We scarcely need add, that never was there greater necessity than now for a thoroughly Church Review, fearless and uncompromising in its tone. The greatest issues are at stake. And yet never was there greater need, that, in the conduct of such a work, which proposes to guide public sentiment, Apostolic firmness and zeal should be tempered with true Christian wisdom and charity. The general character of the **REVIEW** will remain unchanged. With the facilities within our reach, we confidently ask for the active coöperation of the many friends of the work in all parts of the country.

All communications should be directed to

N. S. RICHARDSON,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NEW YORK; 37 Bible House,
Oct. 1, 1867.